

*THE NEW CULTURE
LIBRARY*

PRACTICAL COLLECTING
CITIZENSHIP
ART

HODDER & STOUGHTON, LTD.
PUBLISHERS LONDON, E.C.4

CITIZENSHIP

BY

SHAW DESMOND

AUTHOR OF
"THE SOUL OF DENMARK," "DEMOCRACY"
"PASSION," ETC.

THE NEW CULTURE LIBRARY

HODDER AND STOUGHTON
LTD LONDON

'Citizenship is not theory—but life.'

*Printed in Great Britain by Hazell, Watson & Viney, Ltd.,
London and Aylesbury.*

Contents

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE THING MOST WORTH WHILE	I
II. THE CITIZEN THROUGH THE AGES	7
III. "THE ASCENDING SPIRAL"	13
IV. THE CITIZEN UNDER SLAVERY	20
V. THE MEDIÆVAL AND MODERN CITIZEN	32
VI. CITIZENSHIP—PAGAN AND CHRIS- TIAN	46
VII. CHRISTIANITY AND CITIZENSHIP	60
VIII. THE DEMOCRATIC IMPULSE	68
IX. THE MACHINERY OF CITIZENSHIP	76
X. A GENERATION AGO—AND TO-DAY, OR MUNICIPAL TRADING <i>v.</i> PRIVATE ENTERPRISE	84
XI. MODERN EXPERIMENTS IN CITIZEN- SHIP	106

CHAPTER	PAGE
XII. THE BOLSHEVIK EXPERIMENT	133
XIII. THE ENGLISH AND THE AMERICAN CITIZEN	143
XIV. THE LIMITATIONS OF CITIZEN- SHIP	153
XV. PRIVILEGE AND RESPONSIBILITY	165
XVI. THE MAN AS CITIZEN—AND THE WOMAN	170
XVII. THE TRAINING OF THE PUBLIC SERVANT	188
XVIII. THE DUTIES OF THE CITIZEN . . .	193
XIX. THE TRAINING OF THE CHILD AS CITIZEN	211
XX. THE CITIZEN OF THE WORLD	228
XXI. THE FUTURE OF CITIZENSHIP . . .	239

The Thing Most Worth While

CITIZENSHIP is of all earthly things to-day the thing most worth while. Perhaps it has always been so.

It is only, however, in our times that this statement could have been made without fear of contradiction. Because it is only now that men and women, for the first time in the history of the world, are, in any great number, beginning to *consciously* realise the social interdependence of all human beings and, with it, the urgency of placing this realisation upon an ordered basis. Such basis, in the considered opinion of vast and increasing numbers of people in all countries, alone makes possible human advance—scientific, artistic, social—in these days of new horizons and world-concepts.

You, my fellow-student in this thing most worth while, may be of either sex—you may be workman or professional man, doctor or dustman, clerk or clergyman, artist or athlete, but whatever you are, your work and you

yourself will gain vitally from the study of citizenship, which is the study of man in relation to his fellows. That is, the study of life itself.

In a very real sense, as you are good or bad citizen, so will you be good or bad doctor, artist, or workman.

The individual, however brilliant, who is ignorant of citizenship, is heavily handicapped in the life-race. For citizenship, giving as it does a knowledge of one's fellows, is for every man and woman an essential to progress.

We sometimes forget that it is only through our fellow-creatures we can make our way in life. Whether they help or hinder us depends upon our understanding of them. That is, it depends upon our knowledge of citizenship.

You and I can look at citizenship in one of two ways. As a dead formula or as a living organism. As a corpse for arid dissection by the scalpel of the intellect, or as a living thing. As I take it we are both interested in life and living, and as, in the only sense that matters, citizenship is life itself, we can only regard it from the latter standpoint.

In doing so, we have recognised that our concept of citizenship, to be effective and

guiding, must not be based upon dull formulas, soulless and mechanical. We have realised that citizenship is concerned with living, breathing men and women and not with sociological ciphers.

There is no patent short-cut to a knowledge of citizenship any more than there is a patent recipe for the production of the best citizen. Living experience alone can make the citizen as it alone can give that citizen a conscious citizenship. In this study, every man, in a sense, starts equal. For citizenship is living, not theorising ; thinking, not dogmatising.

That is why writers and thinkers, when they are not mere theorists, differ so widely in their conceptions of citizenship. Each has given his contribution according to his individual experience of life. Each has been dealing with the infinite variety that is life—not with an exact science. But you and I can learn from each.

There is only one theory about multiplication or division as about the chemical constituents of water or air. There are a thousand theories about life. And, as we have said, citizenship is life.

From the first man who entered into

social relationship with one of his fellows, down to the last man who issued the last pamphlet for or against Bolshevism or Conservatism, or the writer of the last letter to the papers upon rates or gas, each has contributed to the concept of citizenship. It is for us to learn from these contributions. It is for us to draw our own conclusions.

At the outset we are faced by an outstanding fact. The fact that in our times man in a thousand ways, direct and indirect, conscious and unconscious, is, throughout the world, concentrating upon this thing, concentrating with a sort of painful eagerness. The thinking European is making the study of citizenship his chief business in life. The American with febrile energy has initiated a series of experiments in citizenship and is developing an entirely new type of citizen. It is beginning to be the new and desperate concern of Asia, whether yellow or brown. Even the North American negro, in his 1920 Universal Negro Improvement Association congress in New York, is feeling the first stirrings of the essential problem of the twentieth century.

Statesmen at Westminster are making this thing their study, and it is a fact that

charwomen and working girls are attending classes on citizenship in the East End of London with men and women of the professional class doing the same thing in the West End.

Why?

Because under the urge of an unexampled series of impulses during the last two hundred years, and especially within the last decade, the whole form of ordered life on the planet has been changing catastrophically, preparing the way for that Democracy which has, for the first time, made its appearance in the story of mankind, and which, however modified it may become, is the nursery for the citizen of the future.

The first of these impulses came from the application of steam power to the machine, which, in changing the social relationship between the employer and the employee, changed with it the concept of citizenship. The last was the Great War of 1914, the war which in its turn unleashed a mass of forces of unknown potency, forces which are only at their beginning, forces that may utterly change society as we know it, and, with it, change citizenship and the citizen.

It is this which has brought to the man of

the twentieth century a recognition that is not so much conscious as unconscious, a recognition that has its roots in the instinct of self-preservation. And such recognitions, as such instincts, are unerring.

What is the recognition?

It is the recognition in the broader, more impersonal sense, that the evolution of conscious, ordered citizenship within the maelström of the tremendous forces now set free can alone save society from anarchy and dissolution. It is the recognition, on the narrower, more personal side, that the men and women of to-day who will set their mark upon their time and who will command the respect and following of their fellows, are the men and women who, interested in citizenship, are making it their study and, what is more important, living it.

For citizenship is not a thing of the laboratories or schools. It is, as we have seen, a living, growing organism, and, in a very real sense, the nucleus of all ordered life upon the earth.

That is why it is "the thing most worth while."

WHENCE ? Why ? Whither ?

That is the triple interrogation with which we are faced in our study. Whence has the citizen of to-day evolved ? Why is he here in his present form ? Whither is he trending ?

That is. His past ? His present ? His future ?

To get a reply, we have to go back to the dawn of humanity, which is the dawn of citizenship itself.

The Stone Man was the first citizen.

Early in the dawn of human life, man must have discovered the advantage of combination. The Stone Man was not only the first citizen—he was the first trades unionist. There is nothing new under the sun.

As we shall later see, the citizen from the dawn of history has been travelling along a sort of ascending spiral pathway. He constantly returns to the same point, but on a higher plane. Man constantly returns to

older concepts of citizenship, but in new and more advanced forms.

Whilst it is perfectly true that ethics have made no progress within historical times, the rules for life and citizenship of men like Plato the Greek and Laotze, the Chinese philosopher, never having been excelled by any modern thinker, the methods of application of those ethics certainly show progress. This is largely due to the development of citizenship.

The whole story of citizenship has been the attempt of man to control his environment instead of being controlled by it. That is, in his earlier stages, to prevent his extinction by hunger and cold, by wild beast and wilder man ; and, in his later, having so to speak secured his physical existence, to develop himself socially—that is, as a citizen. It is in the effort to obtain such control that the citizen has been evolved, first from the Cave Man period, then through the men of the New Stone Age, the Bronze Age, and the Age of Iron.

The Stone Man was individualist incarnate. He was the only logical anarchist. In the beginning, he was the antithesis of citizen. His hand was against every man, every man's hand against him. The dawning of the

instinct of fatherhood which made him defend wife and child from man and beast laid the instinct of citizenship.

The instinct of citizenship was laid in selfishness.

Our Stony Ancestor, at first, would stand naturally only for his own, or, as we would say, for his nearest and dearest—that is, for his family. Citizenship had its roots in the *family*.

Constantly exposed as he was to the attacks of man and beast, the Stone Man was forced irresistibly to combination. Out of such combination with his fellows, arose the social instinct. Man, past or present, is a social animal.

Two families finding themselves or their encampments thrown by chance together, upon being attacked by beasts or men, would unite for defence. From the first accidental combination of two such families was laid the foundations of the *tribe* and with it a fuller concept of citizenship.

After a time, certain unwritten laws would gradually evolve in the tribe. First, things that were not to be done, because they militated against the common good, or, as we would express it, the greatest good of the

greatest number, the securing of which is the essence of citizenship.

Individuals were not to kill members of their own tribe. They were not to steal the meat killed by their fellows.

Later, the laws governing their citizenship would pass from the negative to the positive, which indeed is still the method of progress to-day. They would be bound to help the other members of the tribe in case of attack.

And then, perhaps, the point would be reached when unselfishness would first make its appearance. The day would come when a member of the tribe would voluntarily surrender a portion of his own food for another, perhaps in the first instance for wife or child, and, later—an immense advance—for a member of the tribe outside his own family.

Such surrender would mark the beginning of that unselfish co-operation which indeed is the essential concept of modern citizenship.

The further step of forestalling bad times by laying up provisions would probably not be reached for an immense period afterwards (the Australian aboriginal of to-day has, for instance, little idea of this)—but when that day came, it laid again another milestone in the advance of the citizen. It marked the

sacrifice of the individual for the community. It marked the communal sense.

For citizenship is, deeply, a means of protection and preservation. It is the life-principle which, at all stages of human development, is eternally on guard against those disruptive and destructive forces which circle ceaselessly around the laager of society as the wild beasts circled around the camps of the Stone Men.

Ultimately, the tribe would be forced by the resistless law of combination, which we see not only in the organic but even in the inorganic world (the formation of crystals, for example), and the necessity of combination for self-defence, into the *nation*. With that, the germs of a national and fuller citizenship would be set.

That is where we stand to-day.

But through the breaking down of mechanical barriers by the machine and the annihilation of space by the electric telegraph, "wireless," the locomotive, the steamship, and, now, by the aeroplane, all of which has been inevitably followed by a freer exchange of ideas between the nations of the earth, the nation appears to be passing into the *inter-nation*.

This does not mean that, as citizenship develops, we are going to see greater equality and less individuality. As we shall, later, see, the advance from the simple to the complex in citizenship as in other things makes for greater unity of purpose between the parts of which society is composed, but it makes also for the development of a greater individuality of the separate parts. We see this in the physical structure of the body. We see it in the advance of society. We see it in citizenship itself.

Individuality is the driving force of the universe. It is the driving force of citizenship. But the individuality we are evolving is, if one will, a more flexible individuality—it is an individuality that readily lends itself to co-operation.

It is towards this ideal of “individualist-co-operation” that one ventures to think the citizen is trending.

If we are to grasp the historical ascent of the citizen along “the ascending spiral” of which we have spoken, we shall have to clear our minds of certain prejudices.

The first is the prejudice of “the greatest thing ever.” That is, the dogma that the modern citizen represents the highest point of human development yet reached, socially. Perhaps he does. Perhaps he does not. There is no certainty. We can only say that apparently, in historical times, the idea of citizenship has steadily broadened and developed.

Certain facts should make us humble.

First we have the fact that, so far as can be judged, from the oldest human skulls hitherto unearthed, our remotest ancestors showed little or no inferiority in brain capacity to us. Palæolithic man, lost in the mists of time, showed, for example, extraordinary proficiency as sculptor and artist.

Secondly, whether we go back to the social ethics of Greece or India, China or Egypt, we find we have made little advance in the ethics of human conduct—that is, in citizenship.

Thirdly, having regard to the dead civilisations of which we already know, there is good reason to assume that vast and advanced civilisations in which the concept of citizenship may have reached high development, have vanished from the ken of man.

And lastly, we must not confuse mechanical progress with social progress. The most we can say in this Age of the Machine is that the development of the machine *may* help that of the citizen. It does not always do so.

We have not the time-sense sufficiently developed. We do not always remember that even a thousand years is but a heart-beat in the evolution of the citizen. And we have but ten of these heart-beats upon which to go in our comparisons, for recorded history takes us back but some ten thousand years.

Then, Nature, quietly indifferent to our noble selves, is constantly experimenting with the citizen by casting back, trying old experiments in new forms, "scrapping"

whole societies or even civilisations—as Betsy Gamp would say, “when so dispoged,” and, generally, pulling the strings of the puppets who, imagining they are kings, strut upon the stage of the world.

The ascent of the citizen has not been the even ascent of the inclined plane. If he has ascended, his has been a climbing with numberless drops or set-backs.

The citizen in his progress through the ages has been following the same course as a traveller who has been climbing a spiral path winding round and round a mountain from the base to the summit, a path with many drops in it and many pitfalls. Such a traveller finds himself constantly returning over the same point, but on a higher level. It is the path of the ascending spiral.

In other words, the citizen in his development returns again and yet again to the same principle, but with a newer and, on the whole, usually a better application of that principle.

Take, for instance, the individualism of the Stone Man. In the early days of the Earth Story, this showed itself as anarchy, pure and simple, as we have seen in the last chapter. To-day we also believe in individ-

ualism, but in an individualism tempered by co-operation. It is the same principle to which the citizen has returned in his ascent. But the application is new.

The question is not as to whether individualism, or, to take an extreme case, socialism, is right or wrong. There are no absolute rights or wrongs where citizenship is concerned. The question lies in the application of these two apparently opposing principles—in our day as to how far society shall allow each to modify the other. That is the business of citizenship.

To take another example of the atavistic tendency of the human being. In these days we hear much of socialism. People speak of the principle underlying socialism as though it were something entirely new. But it is something entirely old. It is only in its modern application that it is new.

In ancient Peru, for example, the government of that country by the Incas, the rulers of the country, who began their conquest of Peru about A.D. 1280, was a unique example of benevolent bureaucracy or paternal State socialism. There was no private property. The State owned everything and managed everything. Families and villages were or-

ganised upon a decimal system. But although under this soulless type of socialism the Peruvian citizen knew neither poverty nor idleness, the system fell to pieces before the Spaniards, because there was nothing in it to nourish either patriotism or independence in the individual citizen. There are worse things than poverty and hunger.

But before Peru, Athens and Rome had attempted something of the kind.

To-day, the principle of socialism is having a profoundly modifying effect upon the development of citizenship in all countries, but its application is fast passing from the Peruvian concept of a mechanical State socialism in which the official is supreme, to the ideal of a citizenship of co-operation in which the liberty of the individual citizen shall be secured. It is the life-long struggle between Liberty and Authority out of which citizenship has evolved. Citizenship has returned to the same principle, but with a newer application.

We are always assuming that “we cannot put the clock back.” But we are always doing it. One last example of this return to old principles as the citizen makes his way up the spiral of evolution.

Various communistic experiments in citizenship and society were destroyed by the capitalistic sides of Greece and Rome, were later restored by Christianity, persisted into the Middle Ages, and were destroyed once more by the capitalism of our day. The principle underlying to-day's capitalism is the same as that of Greece and Rome but, through the introduction of power machinery, its application is entirely different. We are constantly returning to the same point, but on a different level.

The Newtonian law that "To every action there is equal and contrary reaction" holds good in the realm of citizenship as in all else. After revolution comes despotism. The period of active reform is followed by the period of conservatism and quiescence. The Puritan follows the light-living Cavalier. A Liberal government follows a Conservative, and so on, *ad infinitum*.

Nature is incredibly patient, for has she not all eternity before her?

But, despite our castings back, always we see, or seem to see, advance. It is the universal law of the ascending spiral.

References

- “On Liberty,” John Stuart Mill.
- “Education,” Herbert Spencer.
- “A Guildsman’s Interpretation of History,” Arthur J. Penty. (Geo. Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1920.)
- “Human Origins,” Samuel Laing.
- “The New Encyclopædia of Social Reform.” (Funk & Wagnalls Co.)

WE have glanced at prehistoric man as citizen, and in doing so have largely had to use conjecture and intuition. Now we shall look at man, the Citizen, with the compass of history to guide us and will see if we cannot make the dry bones of history stand up and walk.

Perhaps the most convenient way in which we can look at the citizen within the historical period is to review his position under Slavery, Serfdom and Feudalism (Mediaevalism), and Capitalism, taking three broad divisions in the evolution of society.

Whilst doing so, we will remember that, despite the valuable contributions to social thought of men like Plato, Aristotle, Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, Hume, Burke, Hegel, Fourier and others, sociology, as such, is a modern science, Comte first using the word in 1838.

In historical times, the story of the citizen largely concerns itself with the city, although

it is true that wherever men and women live in contact with their fellows, they are citizens in the fuller sense of the word. Between the life of the dweller in the city and the life of the peasant outside, there has been ceaseless action and interaction. We cannot consider one apart from the other.

No man can trace the origin of cities. It is lost in the past. Excavators have found city piled on city, as in the case of Troy. Setting on one side the advanced but traceless civilisations which may have existed before history was, it is doubtful whether the earliest cities with which we are acquainted had any civic life in the modern sense, which is not to say they had no citizenship. For wherever the city was, however crude it may have been, there was citizenship.

The first cities of which we have trace seem to have been masses of slave-like men and women gathered behind walls, ruled by despot king or despot priest. It is to Greece, the mother of civilisation as we know it, to which we owe the first recorded collection of men and women into a definite corporate entity. That is, into a more or less *conscious* citizenship.

The Greek citizen was originally a member

of some patriarchal clan, but he quickly developed an organised democratic life. The city was usually supreme and independent of any State. It made treaties, waged war, etc. In the eyes of the citizen it became a personality, assuming a sacred aspect. It built temples, markets, theatres, and gymnasiums. It colonised. It conducted commerce, worship, games, instruction.

Whilst the powers of the individual citizen were limited, the assemblage of citizens was supreme.

Next to the citizens in the Greek city came the "aliens," subject natives or foreigners, having special rights upon payment of special taxes, for even at this early period, taxpaying and citizenship were, as to-day, largely associated. Underneath, were the slaves.

It must not be forgotten that, despite the democracy of the Greek citizen, his was a democracy built upon *slavery*.

In Athens, at one time, there were 140,000 slaves with but 10,000 resident aliens and 21,000 male citizens. Even Aristotle, as St. Paul and some of the greatest men of our own times, defended slavery. But it was slavery that ate out the life of Greece, as, later, it helped to eat out that of Rome.

Yet we have to remember that slavery was an advance upon the cannibalism or slaughter of captives which preceded it in the "hunter" period of human development.

The social thought of Greece concentrated upon "the state," which usually meant the municipality or the city. Citizenship in Athens during the kingly or traditional period showed itself in the popular power of the brotherhoods and clans, anticipating the "guilds" of the Middle Ages, of a proposed reversion to which we hear so much to-day. Once more, the ascending spiral.

After this power had disappeared, Solon revived it by establishing in Athens assemblies composed of all the citizens, with powers to accept or reject laws passed by the council. The citizen was supreme.

The Greek citizen was trained to regard himself as the servant of his city, just as in Greece the whole aim of political thought was the making of "good citizens." He based the whole of his civic concept upon conduct and character, and he regarded education and culture generally as prime essentials to citizenship.

He was distinctly altruistic, having much of that sense of sacrifice for the common

good which is the foundation of society. He regarded himself as holding his wealth in trust for the city. He did not prize wealth for its own sake or for the luxuries it could give him personally. His concept was essentially democratic.

On the other hand, vitiated as he was by his belief in the principle of slavery, he seems to have recognised unquestioningly the right of the State to dominate every single social activity of his own and gladly submitted to his subordination as individual for what he believed to be the good of the whole. As in the case of the modern German state, this led him, irresistibly, to attribute to officialdom and legislation powers which they have never possessed. Like the pre-war German, he fell to a certain extent into the error of believing that the individual citizen could be stamped with any mould by those in authority regardless of individuality. Yet, despite all this, through his cultivation of citizenship, he developed "a more marked individuality as citizen than any State has since been able to obtain, and a joy of living" which no modern has equalled.

With all this, he had an all-round conception of the perfect citizen which has never since

been approached, conceiving of him as a man in whom the intellectual and moral powers were to be balanced by a physical body developed to the uttermost. Old Greece distrusted the municipal councillor with the over-developed brain in the under-developed body.

It is also only fair to say that the Greek concept of citizenship, whilst it lasted, produced, according to the great anthropologist, Francis Galton, from a population of 90,000 in Athens, "two men, Socrates and Phidias, whom the whole population of Europe has never equalled, and fourteen men of an ability of which the Anglo-Saxon race has only produced in 2,000 years five equals."

The object of citizenship, as of the civilisation of which it is the base, is, one takes it, however, not to produce a few outstanding geniuses but to secure a high standard throughout the community. (The genius, incidentally, often makes his appearance during the decadence of a nation or period.) Did Greek citizenship secure this?

According to Galton, the average ability of the Athenian citizen was about as much above that of the English citizen as that citizen is above the African negro, and this view is confirmed by J. A. Symonds, the sociologist.

That would seem to be going too far, although there can be little question that the standard attained by the Greek citizen, despite slavery, was a high one, and it should be borne in mind that the slave could become a freeman or citizen. The fact, however, that our citizen of to-day does not base his concept of society upon slavery gives him immeasurable advantage. Here, at any rate, we can see advance.

What one perhaps might venture to assume and to elaborate, if space permitted, is that whilst the Greek citizen, in the mass, much excelled the modern citizen of, for example, the English-speaking races in intellectual and physical development as in his appreciation of the beautiful, he seems to have been behind them in the more strictly moral aspects of citizenship, or, to use the word which so largely distinguishes our times, in the "spiritual." That is a statement which will be challenged, but one thinks it is, broadly, true.

Of one thing at least we can be fairly certain—that the best citizens of to-day throughout the white races stand for something even higher than their Greek forbears. They have, of necessity, from the age in which they live, a broader knowledge of life, which

shows itself in the dawning of that international concept, which must not be necessarily confused with the modern political term "Inter-nationalism."

The other outstanding example of the citizen under slavery is that of Rome. In Greece the citizen was regarded as being produced by the State. In Rome the State was considered as being produced by the individual. The Greek and Roman concepts were each the antithesis of the other. The citizen of Rome was, roughly, individualist—that of Athens, socialist.

It must always be borne in mind that slavery in the great slave-states like Greece and Rome was accepted as something natural and inherent in life. The slaves themselves took this view. In all the bloody slave revolts which so weakened Greece and Rome, the slave never based his revolt upon any abstract assertion of a right to freedom—only upon the right of the strongest to rule.

It was to Rome that we owe the first beginnings of modern individualism as expressed by men like Locke and Rousseau, as by all thinkers who, regarding the individual as the prime factor, believe that governments only have the right to claim

power so far as they rest upon the consent of the individuals governed. This is the basis of liberty as we moderns conceive it. It is democracy itself. "Democracy" and "Individualism" are but two facets of one whole.

Something that will show the student of citizenship very plainly how our theory of new applications of old principles holds good. The principles are sometimes called by new names, but they are the same principles.

The whole story of the evolution of the Roman citizen is the story of individuals or groups of individuals fighting for their rights. In Roman history, we see families, tribes, gentes, plebeians and patricians each struggling for their own, the strongest surviving, the ideal of citizenship constantly changing form. It was the modern "class-war" in its older form with a vengeance.

To be a *civis Romanus* was once the proudest boast of the Roman. That he had a strong sense of duty to his city was true, but over a long period his duty to his class was still stronger. And it is just here that he was inferior to the best of our modern citizens.

Gradually, in this "class-war," we see the reins of power in Rome gathered into fewer and fewer hands, as to-day we see the reins

of commercial power passing through the same process in the formation of the "Trust."

History is always repeating itself. We see streaming past us in the story of the Roman citizen the plebiscite, the comitia centuriata, tribunes, quæstors, decemvirs, censors, curules, consuls, triumvirs, with, at the last, overshadowing them all, one man—Cæsar, and with him the death of citizenship under the iron heel of autocracy, for, in a sense, the citizen has always been the natural foe of the autocrat. And this despite the fact that Cæsar issued his edicts in the name of the citizens of Rome. The shell of citizenship was kept, but the spirit had departed as from a tomb.

As Lecky says in his "History of European Morals" (vol. i.): "The various offices of the Republic were not annihilated, but gradually concentrated in a single man."

It is illuminating to note, as expressing the immemorial tendency of human beings to "pigeon-hole" their ethics according to their prejudices, that the Roman citizen of the later stages did not find it inconsistent with a high standard of fatherhood as of interest in his city, to attend the Games and watch the agonies of beasts and men in the brutal exhibitions of the Coliseum.

The Roman citizen, like the Greek, considered the social problems about him from the political rather than from the economic standpoint. The citizen of to-day is more and more regarding his municipal affairs from the economic point of view. That this is so, is clearly demonstrated by the fact that men constantly vote differently in municipal politics and state politics. In London you can have a conservative government sitting at Westminster and a "progressive" majority on the London County Council.

The study of political economy, which is the hallmark of to-day's citizenship, is essentially, although not entirely, modern. For that matter, most modern questions, in national as in municipal politics, tend more and more to resolve themselves into economic questions, which is one reason for the formation of groups representing the great commercial interests in the British House of Commons, irrespective of party, into "coalition governments."

This, whilst apparently causing a blurring of political idealism, has really brought a greater "consciousness" to the individual citizen by clearing the issues, enabling him to shape his course as citizen, both nationally and

municipally, with clearer perception of the problems involved.

It will be noticed how steadily impossible it is becoming for us to relegate citizenship to purely local affairs. Citizenship in the slave-state involved the consideration primarily or wholly of local questions. The citizenship of to-day involves that of national. To-morrow's citizenship will involve that of inter-national.

Did space permit, a study of the Jew as citizen under the Mosaic law and the mild form of slavery which existed amongst the Hebrews, would here be of interest, as would that of the citizen under the slave-systems of Russia, Egypt, etc., to the last of which reference is made in the next chapter. A study of the Old Testament books bearing upon the Jew as citizen will repay the reader.

References

- “ History of Political Economy,” Prof. Ingram.
- “ The New Encyclopædia of Social Reform.” (Funk & Wagnalls Co.)
- “ A Guildsman’s Interpretation of History,” Arthur J. Penty. (Geo. Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1920.)
- “ History of European Morals,” Lecky.
- “ The Ethics of Aristotle.”
- “ The Old Testament.”
- “ Rome,” W. Warde Fowler.

WHEN we pass from the citizen under *Slavery* and come to his development under the *Serfdom* and *Feudalism* to which Slavery gradually gave place, as they in turn gave place to that *Capitalism* which we shall also here consider, we find a certain ethical advance in citizenship.

Right from the beginning, *slavery* was modified wherever religious institutions were dominant, and intensified wherever the soldier dominated the priest, but it was not until the second century that slavery began to be regarded as morally indefensible, Dio Chrysostom, Trajan's adviser, pronouncing it to be contrary to natural law.

Whilst Christianity in its dawn did not at once indict slavery as a crime, it was really due to Christianity that an atmosphere was created favourable to the serfdom that supplanted it, the slave gradually coming to be regarded as a servant tied to the soil—i.e., as a serf. The original serf was almost a

slave. The moment the slave, first under the Stoic and, later, under the Christian philosophy, was regarded as a human being, having rights under the Roman law, the system was doomed. Both Antoninus and his successor legislated towards this end. Freed from the degrading idea of slavery as a necessary part of society, the citizen took a leap forward.

It must not be thought, however, that each system of society, slavery, serfdom, feudalism, etc., succeeded its predecessor without overlapping. Slavery, serfdom, and a modified form of capitalism have existed side by side, in Russia e.g., the original rural peasant population consisting of slaves and freemen, serfdom itself not being abolished until 1861, and then in name rather than in fact.

Feudalism, the basic principle of which was land tenure, was largely blended with the serfdom out of which it arose, and, indeed, at no time was a clean-cut logical system having separate existence. It was a system existing in varied forms in Northern and Western Europe throughout the Middle Ages, and under it, land was held by its owners as "fiefs" upon condition of serving their superior lord, especially in war. Gener-

ally speaking, it was an advance upon serfdom, based as it was upon reciprocal rights and duties, the fief having greater freedom than the original serf and slowly but unconsciously preparing his class for the fuller duties and privileges of his successors and affecting the whole relationship of the citizen to the State.

The origin of feudalism is unsure, although some believe it arose from the Roman custom of making land grants to tribes in return for military service. It grew from the fifth to the ninth century, when it reached fairly full development in Germany and fullest development in England after the Norman Conquest. The more immediate reason for its existence was probably the urgent need of protection from the robber bands which, upon the break-up of the orderly government of the Roman Empire, overran Europe and preyed upon the industrious population.

Split into groups, the people who worked, finding themselves forced to self-defence, would naturally divide into soldiers and workers, the more daring choosing the former occupation, ultimately producing the feudal chieftain or lord who, in return for military protection, demanded the obedience of the

others, who would be his vassals. Hence would arise the feudal system.

This, it is of interest to observe, was an almost exact replica of the relationship of Patrons and Clients, into which Rome was originally divided.

It was Feudalism which shore the city of some of its power, exalting the country, but wherever feudalism was weak, as along the Rhine, in Italy and South France, the free city grew strong, growing by art and commerce, not by war. This growth continued rapidly through the eleventh and twelfth centuries, exalting the trader over the noble and warrior, the city gradually, however, as nationhood developed, becoming part of the State.

Here it may be noted that a feudal system appears early to have developed in China and Japan, disappearing in the former country about 220 B.C. and in Japan lasting until A.D. 1871. Feudal tenures were abolished by act of parliament in England in 1660.

In the towns, however, as opposed to the country, the citizens by the establishment of Guilds and the maintenance of what they called a "Just and Fixed Price," as well as by the organisation of train-bands, were

able to keep in hand both the profiteer and the brigand. One will not be very far wrong if one regards the Guilds as the nucleus of citizenship in the Middle Ages, using the word in its narrower sense.

When with our modern brain we try to place ourselves within that of mediæval man, we find it to be no easy task.

So far as the serf on the land was concerned, he in no sense aspired to be regarded as citizen. There was perhaps in individual cases dawning in him a sort of hazy citizenship, in the sense of aspiration towards freemanship, and with it, as his rights increased, a growing consciousness of himself as a human unit rather than as a chattel of the community. Certain it is that, as a class, he never contemplated becoming an active member in the ordering of society, any more than a member of our modern slum population would contemplate it.

In the fief or feudal vassal, however, the sense of reciprocal rights and duties began to define itself, laying the beginnings of what is indeed one of the foundations of citizenship to-day. As the "Treatise of Tenures" says, he was prepared to kneel before his liege, holding his hands together between those

of his lord, and say : “ I become your man from this day forward, of life and limb, and of earthly worship. . . . ” after which his lord kissed him, but in return for his allegiance he expected his lord on his part to perform his duties, even though his expectations were not always realised. In other words, like his descendant, the modern voter, the feudal vassal expected service in return for privileges. However faintly, he began to feel himself as playing a part in society not altogether negative. In the peasant of the more remote country districts of England and Germany to-day we find his counterpart.

Within the cities of the Middle Ages, we find the very basis of citizenship as we know it, in some ways an even superior conception.

The mediæval craftsman, who was the backbone of the European city and who organised its guilds, forerunners of the modern trades unions, had a high sense of citizenship. He had that sense of the city as a living entity possessed by the Greeks, and which we moderns have so largely lost. A distinguishing characteristic was his democracy, but a democracy tempered by a recognition of the limits of liberty, sometimes ignored by the more revolutionary spirits of our day.

For craftsmanship, as for the principle of mastership, he had innate respect. For him, the artist stood next to the priest as the interpreter of God. His craft was to him largely the measure of his citizenship. As Professor Lethaby says: "In the Middle Ages, the Masons' and Carpenters' Guilds were faculties or colleges of education in those arts, and every town was, so to say, a craft university."

The citizen of the Middle Ages, indeed, found his citizenship, first through his guild, and then through his city. His greatest reward was civic dignity. His pride was in his city, and it can be said of him that he developed a very conscious though localised citizenship.

One of the most curious paradoxes of citizenship is the fact that, in the Middle Ages, when, contrary to the popular belief to-day, "the divine right of kings" was never admitted and when the king was regarded not so much as autocratic ruler as the preserver of the State, kings throughout Europe were more beloved of their subjects than they are to-day. The monarch was made for the citizen, not the citizen for the monarch.

Dr. Otto Gierke, in his "Political Theories of the Middle Ages," says: "The Mediæval doctrine taught that every command which exceeded the limits of the ruler's authority . . . obliged none to obedience. And then, again, it proclaimed the right of resistance, and even armed resistance, against . . . any unrighteous . . . measure. . . ."

This throws a flood of light upon the outlook of the mediæval citizen and explains his intense jealousy of any interference with his rights by king or noble. In a word, he regarded himself as "a citizen of no mean city." His city became to him not only of local and personal significance but a defender of national rights. We here see the dawn of the modern broader national concept of citizenship.

It was not that the city dweller thought especially about the conditions of the peasant or that part of the nation dwelling outside the city, except so far as they reacted upon himself, but he was beginning to think about them.

We must not forget that in England, at any rate, both in Saxon and in Norman times, the people had some say in the making of the laws under which they lived, but

gradually this right was partially lost, until the Magna Charta of 1215 restored it.

When we come to consider the citizen under *Capitalism*, we find in our ascending spiral that the city of to-day, as in the case of the later Roman city, has lost some of its identity and privileges and has been overshadowed by the State, into which it has merged.

The modern French, British, German, or American city is dominated by the State. It draws its powers from the State. Whilst it fixes its rates, it is the national official who so often collects its taxes. Although it is held responsible for maintaining internal order, it has no separate armed force at its command but has to call upon the armed forces of the nation if it needs help.

One of the causes that led to the break-up of feudalism and the entrance of capitalism was not only the gradual development of a more ordered and orderly society but the spread of currency as a medium of exchange, which, by facilitating intercourse, helped to bring about greater fluidity and uniformity of life. Later, in the eighteenth century, came that disintegrator of society, steam, which switched the current of human progress into an entirely new channel and, giving man for

the first time mastery over matter, began the evolution of that citizen who, if his spiritual equals his mechanical advance, shall some day "be as a god."

The coming of the power-machine was followed by the industrial and political revolutions of the last century which have shorn the city of its independent powers and destroyed the guilds.

The city in point of size has grown enormously. It has become shapeless. The coming of the railroad and the rise of the factory system, with the centralisation of production, has crowded the people into the cities and resulted in hypertrophy of growth with atrophy of function.

On the other hand, the modern city has taken over many of the functions of the Church in the Middle Ages, such as the feeding of the poor. Sanitation, education, police, light and water are its province. The citizen of our times is faced by a complicated and unwieldy series of problems and is having to educate himself whilst he tackles them—a most difficult position.

Power is rapidly passing from the hands of Parliament into the hands of the Municipality. The municipal councillor will soon be of more

importance than the M.P. The decay of parliament has intimate connection with the rise of citizenship, only neither the M.P. nor the councillor perhaps knows it.

One reason that this applies especially to the English city is that the administrative system of English government has never been largely centralised, despite the fact that the early development of a central government, as compared for example with Italy and Germany, prevented the English city from reaching the same independent life as the German or Italian city.

It is a fact well known to men and women who have taken active part in the Labour movement, that there has been within the last decade, and especially since the war, an increasing tendency for the average Trades Unionist to think primarily through his Trade Union branch and the local labour representation body (leading inevitably to the municipality) rather than through Parliament. Initiative more and more comes from the trade union branch rather than from Parliament, because action is not so delayed and the machine functions more readily and is more easily understood.

It is this which helps to explain the fact

of the comparative indifference of the organised worker to direct labour representation in Parliament (Labour only polls enough votes to put in one-tenth of the national assembly as representative of its millions) and with it that modern passion for decentralisation of activity and control which has shown itself in the after-the-war strikes and the drift towards a modified Sovietism involving the repudiation of national leaders and especially of the labour M.P.s.

Further, it is the local municipal machine the unions and organised labour have sought to capture rather than the central stronghold of parliament, partly because many of the organised workers believe that with the out-works of the municipality captured, the inner citadel of parliament will automatically pass into their hands when the time comes, if they care to use it, and partly because parliament has ceased to have the significance it once had in their eyes. There can be little question that we are about to see startling though perhaps not immediate changes on this side of citizenship.

To sum up, the position of the citizen under Capitalism differs from his position under Feudalism in many ways.

On the one hand, his feeling of divorcement from and indifference to his city, brought about by the coming of the factory system and the introduction of the *laissez faire* policy of free competition, is now, owing to the increase of the spirit of co-operation and the study of political economy, being replaced, not so much by a sense of local citizenship, as in the Middle Ages, as by a national citizenship manifesting itself, first, in an interest in civic affairs and, ultimately, in the national bearing of those affairs. And it cannot too strongly be emphasised that, despite its drawbacks, it was the bringing together of the workers under the factory system that made their organisation and finally their education into citizenship possible.

The power of the city as a unit has declined, but that of the citizen grown immeasurably.

The significance which citizenship is rapidly assuming is shown by the countless indoor and street-corner meetings in the English-speaking countries, for the street corner to-day, instead of being a crime nursery, is now often the nursery of the future citizen. These local parliaments, for that is what they are, are making excellent debating-grounds for the men and women who one day will direct our

civic and national affairs in all countries. For only upon such grounds can the foundations of citizenship be laid.

The European citizen of to-day is less and less concerning himself with his duty to his party—he has long since largely ceased to concern himself with his duty to “ his pastors and masters ”—he is concentrating more and more upon his duty to himself and his family and, after that, upon his duty to his city and his State. The citizenship of to-day, as that of the Stone Age, is being founded upon a sort of enlightened selfishness, but upon a higher plane.

For into it is creeping the spirit of civic and national co-operation.

References

- “ Political Theories of the Middle Ages,” Dr. Otto Gierke.
- “ The New Encyclopædia of Social Reform ” (Funk & Wagnalls Co.).

No study of citizenship and the city would be complete without some detailed consideration of the profound effect upon both of the coming of Christianity. The Pagan citizen and the Christian citizen were two different men.

First, it will be illuminating of the evolution of pagan citizenship to take a quick bird's-eye view of the more mechanical side of history in the pagan states of Greece and Rome. In our consideration of the citizen under slavery we have already looked at it from the human standpoint.

Mr. Arthur J. Penty, in his "A Guildsman's Interpretation of History," shows effectively how the whole basis and development of citizenship was altered by the introduction of currency, for the first time, in the seventh century before Christ, by the Lydian kings, who used metal bars of *fixed* weight as mediums of exchange, rendering possible the specialisation of the arts and crafts and facilitating exchange.

Thus the merchant-class came into exist-

ence, that class which, specialising in finance, became creditors as time went on of the peasantry outside the towns, greatly emphasising the power of the city and stamping itself with “the money-outlook.”

The Greeks, perturbed by the abuses and problems following the introduction of currency, gave it much thought, Plato in his “*Laws*” forbidding bargaining and insisting upon fixed prices, in which he anticipated the mediæval guilds and the “maximum prices” of our own times.

The early Greek lawgivers attempted to solve these abuses by restricting the accumulation of wealth by the individual citizen, Lycurgus holding the communal life of Sparta intact by restricting currency.

With the coming of the twenty-seven years’ Peloponnesian War against Athens, in which profiteering by the plutocracy was rampant, and the need for coined money for a fleet, the Spartans threw over the laws of Lycurgus. Wealth tended to accumulate in fewer hands, there remaining finally in Sparta only some 600 property owners, of whom but 100 enjoyed the full rights of citizenship, the poorer citizens being shut out from all civic administration.

The great lawgiver Solon in Attica tried another remedy, tacitly accepting currency with the social changes resulting and substituting property instead of birth as the standard to decide the rights and duties of citizens. The citizens were in four classes, their grade being determined by the type of military service rendered and by the amount contributed in taxes. The lowest grade paid no taxes and could not take public office. They could however take part in the people's assembly as in the courts of law administered by the people.

From the war against Athens until the Roman Conquest, the cities of Greece fell prey to a series of revolutions, alternating between the pulling down and reinstatement of the rich. The unemployed problem, with resultant discontent, became so acute that Alexander the Great started the conquest of Asia to solve it, planting colonies of unemployed Greeks as far east as Cabul.

Nothing is new—not even the unemployed ! Even the modern Joint Stock company had its forerunners just before the second Punic war.

Through all the period under review, civic administration and laws largely concerned

themselves with the limitation of usury, and in 181 B.C. special laws had to be passed against bribery in elections.

During the decline and fall of the Roman Republic (146 B.C.—27 B.C.) the Roman government was that of a City-State, the Roman Senate, who really corresponded to our modern aldermen, attempting unsuccessfully to rule an empire instead of being content to rule a city. The citizen army was replaced by professional soldiers, and in Rome itself there was the most glaring and dangerous contrast of riches and poverty. In 89 B.C., the Social or Marsic War ended in the granting of Roman citizenship to the citizens of all the allied states in Italy, although the franchise could only be exercised in Rome itself, Rome thus beginning to lose her character as a City-State.

With the advent of Augustus, who became emperor in 27 B.C., the Republic changing into an Empire, Rome took a new lease of life, developing an intensively centralised bureaucracy, despotic but practical, popular institutions being restored in form only.

Augustus knew that full bellies make easy heads, and, whilst dividing the city into wards for police purposes, much as the modern American city is divided, saw that the half

million of Romans were well fed and well amused. He chose corps of watchmen from the freemen of the city. The city's supply of corn and water was rigidly organised and many public buildings for council chambers, theatres, etc., were erected.

Mastering as he had the hypnotic power of forms and phrases over the average man, the magistrates, Senate, and assemblies were nominally restored as under the Republic, but the people had little or no power.

In other words, he inaugurated "the Servile State," keeping order by subtly undermining the independence and initiative of the citizen, ultimately leading to collapse inevitable. The Roman citizen gained peace and plenty at the price of freedom.

About this time, the popular bulwarks of the Collegia, probably a sort of Roman friendly society, lost their separate identity, being merged with the State. It was the system of delegating special functions to organised groups of workers, much as the modern Guild Socialist proposes it, which led to the establishment of these Collegia in the various trades, that of the building industry, for example, carrying out the work of the fire brigade in the Roman towns.

Severus Alexander, it may be said, incorporated all industries in guilds, regulating their legal status at the same time.

From A.D. 313 to A.D. 476, that is to the fall of the Western Empire, Roman administration largely resolved itself into a *panem et circenses* view of citizenship, something not altogether unknown in our own times, in which “bread and circuses” helped to keep the citizen lulled. This was accompanied by widespread immorality and a decline in the birth-rate, which Christianity was too late to cure.

We see from the above that in Rome the world-old battle of centralisation or decentralisation which is agitating the citizen of to-day was being thrashed out.

In the case of the Roman, the centralised government, becoming more and more paternal, destroyed all initiative and vigour in the cities, especially in the provincial cities, and so Rome ultimately collapsed before the virile attack of the individualist Barbarians.

Seen from the human standpoint, we discover from history that the fundamental difference between the Pagan and Christian concepts of citizenship was that the former was, in essence, a materialist and the latter a spiritual concept. At the best, the former

was largely an ethical concept, founded upon the intellect and uninformed by passion, that is by feeling—whilst the latter made its appeal to that deathless aspiration of the individual towards good which, instinctive in the human race, and being, as it is, the mainspring of evolution, triumphs generation after generation over the baser things of life, showing itself now in one form, now in another—but to-day primarily in citizenship. “Do unto others as you would they should do unto you” might, basically, be taken as the newer spirit behind the citizenship of the Twentieth Century.

Christ was, perhaps, the greatest citizen of all time.

Here we are not considering Christ and the Christianity he taught from the standpoint of dogmatic religion. One is considering both from the human standpoint, not the divine.

The cult of materialism under Paganism had resulted more and more in a sort of mental inturning of the individual citizen, leading to the slough of self-sufficiency and indulgence, reacting disastrously upon the community, especially as the pagan cities grew in wealth and power. Christianity came to teach the citizen renunciation both of world and self,

not contempt of either, and taught him to find in the sacrifice of self for the good of others the newer citizenship.

Paganism, on the other hand, had set out to conquer the world. Instead, the world had conquered Paganism.

One of the most fascinating as it is one of the most instructive books for the student who is interested in the effect of Christianity on citizenship, is the immortal "*Salammbo*" of Gustave Flaubert. Here the great Frenchman has, literally, inserted himself into the pagan mentality.

The pagan concept of citizenship in Carthage, for instance, was that of the vampire. Carthage herself was divided into the classes of the Priests, the Rich, the Freemen, and the Slaves, and developed an extraordinarily minute and efficient system of internal administration ; but the Carthaginian councillor sought only the aggrandisement and expansion of his own city at the expense of others, and it has been truly written of Carthage that she lived upon the life-blood of other peoples. She wrung exorbitant taxes from her subject peoples, upon whom she executed the most abominable tortures. Governors were esteemed according to the amount of blood-

money or tribute they succeeded in extracting.

The city councillor was a blend of the devout, the crafty, and the pitiless. "The Ancients," or members of the supreme council, were guilty of acts of treachery not only towards the Mercenaries who protected the city but towards all people not of Carthage, which are amongst the blackest records in civic administration.

The minute fulfilment of ceremonial towards Moloch and the other gods and goddesses was an important part of Carthaginian citizenship, but the citizenship was partisan, informed by a curious blending of bestiality and vice with a genuine affection for the city.

But apart from the spiritual gulf that divided the pagan from the christian conception of citizenship, there was a gulf of idea. The old Pagan city-states, like their successors in idea, the German Junkers, as in that autocracy of democracy, the Bolshevik "dictatorship of the proletariat," believed they were entirely justified in the mechanical regulation of each part of the lives of their citizens, "because the State did it for the good of the majority," and in this they had the

endorsement of their philosophers. Citizenship based upon Christianity, on the other hand, is aiming more and more at a minimum of control with a maximum of individual liberty.

We have only room for a passing reference to two other pagan views of the citizen and his duties—one, the Egyptian, the other, the Chinese—both concepts differing fundamentally from all other pagan ideals and from each other.

The following extracts from the famous Book of the Dead compress the Egyptian ideal of the duty of the citizen toward his fellows as well as anything.

The ancient Egyptian of the time of Menes had a strong civic sense, the soul appearing before Osiris saying : “ I have been kind to slaves ; I have made no fraudulent gains ; seized no lands wrongfully ; not tampered with weights and measures ; not cut off or monopolised watercourses.”

Also the sense of poor relief : “ I have not taken the milk from sucklings ; have given food to the hungry, drink to the thirsty, clothed the naked and been good to widows.”

Finally, that association of religion with citizenship, which, divorced from each other

over long periods of time, appears once more to be reasserting itself vaguely in the Christian citizenship of our day, but upon a non-dogmatic plane: "I have done nothing hateful to the gods; not molested sacred beasts or birds; I am pure; I am pure!"

And all this represented an ideal of civic conduct developed so long ago as 4450 B.C. It was accompanied over a historical period alone of some four thousand years by highly evolved schemes of administration as the records show, an administration founded upon piety to the gods; loyalty to the throne; obedience to superiors; justice and mercy to inferiors; and by strict moral conduct.

The story of Chinese citizenship begins historically in 2350 B.C. in a book called "The Shu King," which shows a social order of exceptional interest. The chief citizen is the emperor, Yao, who rules only from his capital Ke-Choo in Shan-Tung by the consent of his people. His successor, Shun, developed the civic administration still further, appointing a General Regulator and Administrator of Works, who took charge of the waterways and dykes. There was also an Officer of Crime who was responsible for the Chinese Scotland Yard of that day, and one of

Ceremonies, who had charge of the worship in the ancestral temples. There were also central authorities in charge of Music, of Poetry, and of Communications.

Every three years there was an examination of all officers, the industrious being advanced and the idle degraded.

The records from 2350 B.C. to 1770 B.C. are minute and show that the training of the Chinese municipal councillor of that period embraced the laws of government and the study of economics, this last an extraordinary anticipation of what is generally regarded as a purely modern study.

In the *Li Chi* or “The Book of Ritual” of Kung fu tze or Confucius (551 B.C.), every side of civic life, with rules for its living, is dealt with fully. It includes the laws of propriety and good manners; the proceedings of government; “rites in the formation of character;” and gives close details for the proper ordering of sacrifices; ancestor worship; education; music, and marriage. Modern citizenship has not yet reached the point of concerning itself with marriage, but it does concern itself with such things as music, in our parks, etc. Who is to say where it will stop?

As in the case of other pagan peoples, if one can really call the Chinese "pagan," for Lao tze's philosophy approaches nearly the teaching of the New Testament, as for that matter did the teaching of some of the great Indian sages who lived long before Christ, the whole of the Chinese systems of religion and government were harmonious and inter-dependent.

These parallels are always occurring in the history of citizenship. For instance, the Code of Laws of Khammurabi, of the Early Babylonian Empire founded in 2239 B.C., which had a very exact ordering of society, parallels in places, and almost word for word, the social laws of the Pentateuch, or first five books of the Old Testament.

The sage Lao tze, who lived about the same time as Confucius, did much to improve Chinese citizenship upon the philosophic side, teaching as the very foundation of the social order, duty towards one's neighbour as the Indians put it forward in the teaching of *dharma*.

The difference between the two men might be expressed in this way. If the question were put to them: "How shall the citizen be reformed?" Confucius would have replied:

“By doing;” Lao tze: “By not doing.” The first wished the social reformer to “form;” the other was against all *compulsory* inducement of virtue in the citizen. Together, they really represented the essential of citizenship, which is a minimum of control with a maximum of individual liberty.

But in all this there would seem to be a certain mechanically perfect ordering of the citizen. In it there is little of that feeling, fanaticism if you will, which characterised the early Christian communal concept of the Apostles. There was no desire to convert the world. The Chinese, as the Egyptian and Carthaginian, the Greek and other pagan concepts, were self-sufficient and self-contained.

References

- “A Guildsman’s Interpretation of History,” Arthur J. Penty. (Geo. Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1920.)
- “Salammbo,” Gustave Flaubert.
- “The Book of the Dead.”
- “Chinese Religion,” Wm. Loftus Hare.
- “On Liberty,” John Stuart Mill.

AN excellent case can be made out for Christianity largely finding its driving force in its outset by its care for the improvement of social relationships in this world and for citizenship generally, the early Christians developing a strong communal sense, the Apostles, as a matter of fact, "having all things in common." Its care was for this world as well as that of the world to come, and it is this same irresistible association of the ideal and the practical which we are to-day finding in our later developments of civic life, particularly in Great Britain and the United States, countries which have a certain genius for citizenship. The only difference is that this modern association is constantly demanding a larger platform for its operation than was possible under early Christianity.

It is Christ's world-concept of citizenship which we are beginning to evolve.

The writer, who has had the opportunity of studying citizenship at first hand in many

of the European countries as in the United States, would venture to suggest that this association of the ideal and practical finds its highest developments in the English-speaking lands.

In the mind of those communities of early Christians, the Fatherhood of God involved the Brotherhood of Man.

At the time that Christ appeared, Palestine was honeycombed by secret guilds or sodalities of slaves and the lower grades of artisans, and it was no accident that, as tradition has it, it was to these organised communities that Christ made his primary appeals, living their lives and preaching the fraternity of mankind, thus developing the foundations of Christian citizenship which seeks equal advantages and opportunities for all men, irrespective of class.

Only, and here is the thing that matters, the great teacher did not base his appeal to his hearers as members of some local organisation or place, but—that concept which after some two thousand years is only just beginning to be realised concretely in our modern citizenship—“as citizens of the world.”

It is profoundly affecting and curious to see how Christian concepts of social relation-

ships spread amongst the slaves up to the third century and to discover that it was by these despised of men the seeds of modern citizenship were set.

It is perfectly true that the Christian teaching largely ignored the State as it ignored all those questions of social systems with which our citizenship of to-day is so vitally concerning itself, simply, as it seems to the writer, because its concern with the machinery of state would largely have blurred the new spirit which that teaching represented and which the failure of Paganism had made essential if the whole social fabric were not to crumble. It is, however, quite clear that Christ, recognising as he did the necessity of social organisation, repeatedly said that he had come to fulfil the laws of the Old Testament upon which the perfectly "arranged" citizenship of the Jews had been based. As it has been well said, what he did was to spiritualise the materialist conceptions of the Jewish law by introducing the spirit of brotherhood and humanity. These conceptions were to be fulfilled by love, not by force. That still remains the highest ideal of citizenship.

How vitally Christianity changed the whole

conception of citizenship is shown by its attitude towards the slave, the child, and the woman.

It destroyed slavery by establishing for the first time the equality of all men before God. But it recognised the principle of spiritual aristocracy, that is to say, the recognition of the enormously varying spiritual and moral and intellectual capacities of human beings, which to-day in our spiral of citizenship is once more obtaining recognition, notably by writers like H. G. Wells, who recognises it in his "*Mankind in the Making*" and "*The New Republicanism*."

It is this growing recognition which would seem to be sending the citizen along a path towards a spiritual aristocracy combined with an economic equality, and it is this aristocracy which one thinks is ultimately destined to replace the aristocracies of blood (that is birth) and gold (that is the plutocracy) in the citizen's evolution.

The slave in old Rome, denied all rights as citizen, when under examination by the torture would reply: "I am no slave. Christ has freed me," claiming his citizenship as freeman and citizen. But it was a world-citizenship, not a Roman.

It was the Christian Fathers who first denounced the practice in Rome of exposing and mutilating unwanted children, even Seneca, the Stoic philosopher, approving the exposure of sickly infants. Constantine (A.D. 315) forbade it, whilst civic houses of mercy were founded by Justinian, the Council of Nice in A.D. 325 ordering the foundation of children's hospitals in the chief cities, all this foreshadowing the school clinics, hospitals, and similar civic activities of to-day.

The event in our time with the greatest potentialities for citizenship is, at least in the writer's opinion, the coming of woman—first, on to the town council and then to Parliament. For, as ever, citizenship has been the nurture-bed for the seeds of the national harvest.

Roman law was, essentially, male law, giving almost unlimited power to the father. Over his wife, the husband had powers of life and death under the old Roman law. Her property became his. The Roman woman was citizen only in name.

A stoical jurist, Paul, writes in the third century: "Women in every kind of affairs and obligations, whether in behalf of men or women, are prohibited from having any concern."

The Christian emperors changed all this. Under Justinian, the tutelage of women was abolished and the laws of divorce rendered more equal as between the sexes.

Origen, one of the Fathers of the Church, born in A.D. 185, writes : "There is not a Christian community which has not been exempted from a thousand vices and a thousand passions." The position of the woman under Christianity as compared with her position under Paganism was indeed as light to darkness.

What is illuminating is to note that as citizenship, so to speak, crystallised during the classic period of Greece, as it emerged from the legendary or heroic age, the position of the woman as citizen distinctly deteriorated. This was probably due to the fact that before social laws, founded upon property considerations, had hardened into the conception of woman as a piece of property, fixing her in place regardless of her intellectual or moral capacity, her position in the community was decided more by her individual charm and character.

Here our spiral illustration is very clear. Society first formed itself around woman the mother, but as law developed, founded as

it was largely on force, she, physically the weaker, gradually came to be regarded as slave, and then as slave and toy combined. Now, as we ascend the spiral, woman is coming back to her own and society is once more forming itself about her, not only on a higher but on a more extended plane.

But this is due to Christianity.

The old Greeks were the first to institute monogamy, but their first citizens kept their concubines publicly, nor did this affect their social standing. Woman was regarded as man's inferior. From the civic standpoint marriage was looked at primarily as the means of producing citizens, not for itself, and to this end the Greek law protected the wife to some extent, but fettered her to her home, as indeed many moderns would still do.

Significant was it that in old pagan Greece it was the *hetæra* or courtesan who alone was free to develop her brain and body. She became man's intellectual comrade and equal. Statesmen like Pericles and philosophers like Socrates honoured her both in private and in public. Vice, it may be said, was both practised and extolled by the leading Athenian citizens. How far the standard of citizenship has advanced to-day is shown by what

would be the attitude of the modern citizen towards a councillor who openly consortred with prostitutes.

Christianity, in a sentence, has saved citizenship from a one-sided concept of life by recognising woman as man's equal and comrade, thus making it possible for her to bring to bear upon its problems the feminine outlook. For now, as in the Stone Age, woman in citizenship is, generally, the conserving, man, the creative element.

References

- “The Ancient Lowly,” C. Osborne Ward.
- “Mankind in the Making,” and “The New Republicanism,” H. G. Wells.
- “The New Testament.”

TWENTY-FIVE years ago, the American and European, and particularly the English mind, was becoming more and more exercised as to citizenship, the politics of which, for the first time, began to assume a significance which threatened to challenge that of national politics.

For citizenship throughout the world was beginning to be transformed before the onrush of democracy. For the first time, pioneers of social-political thought were demanding everywhere, not the aggrandisement and development of the *nation*, but the development of the *citizen*. Men and women, not all of them visionary, saw in the ideas then fermenting, if not a new heaven, at least a new earth opening out for mankind through such commonplace things as light and sanitation, houses and water. For the first time in history, men and women were beginning to understand that politics were not "politics" but life itself.

If one were asked to compress into a sentence

the idea in the minds of the reformers of that time, one would say it was this : " Feed your citizen ; clothe your citizen ; educate him and give him the vote—do this and all other virtues shall be added unto him."

To-day, we are not quite so sure.

That day's conception was, in essence, a material conception with a spiritual goal. To-day, it is beginning to dawn upon the reformer that, even in his more elementary stage, the citizen does not live by bread alone—not even by books. There is, for example, coming to some of the noblest minds that, whilst starvation is an ugly thing, starvation does not happen by accident—that at certain stages of evolution it may be a necessary spur to individual endeavour. In a word, that nothing happens without meaning. As the body develops its own anti-toxins to its own poisons, mankind makes its own medicines and its own cures.

Which does not imply a retrogression to the old thumb-twiddling idea of leaving it all to providence. The sitting down and doing nothing. The ignoring of such mundane things as drains and washing and food.

In the nineties we saw a vast stirring of humanity to a social idealism which showed it-

self in the wide-sweeping victories for the democratic parties, not only in the parliaments but in the municipalities of Europe, culminating in Great Britain, in the first decade of the present century, in the return of the Labour Party to the House of Commons in 1906. The "labour" or co-operative ideal of citizenship ran mercurial through large sections of the population. The excitements and anticipations of that time still stand out in the memory.

Of all phenomena connected with the making of the new citizen, this trend to the labour concept was, perhaps, the outstanding, though not by any means the only one, for a similar trend was observable in all degrees of politics from Radicalism, through Radical-Socialism and Christian-Socialism to Republicanism and Tory Democracy. Even the Liberals and Conservatives of Europe were being affected. Italy and France, Germany and England, as the United States, were feeling the influx of the new ideas, not only in political and civic but in religious circles.

The democracy was being regarded by all sorts and conditions of men and women as the new revelation, a revelation that had first been given in its more extreme form to the

proletariat throughout Europe by a German, one Karl Marx, finding itself especially in the intellectual matrix of the German, Scandinavian, and Latin races in the form of "the materialist conception of history," that is, the dogma that man is formed solely by his physical environment. It was a revelation, at any rate, which attempted without success to find its spiritual home within the sentimental and idealistic brain of the English people.

In its more modified forms, the Christian Socialists of America and Europe were preaching the new revelation as a nineteenth-century crusade.

In Germany, men like Bebel and Bernstein ; in France, Briand, Millerand and Jaurès ; in Italy, Turati and Ferri and Labriola ; in Austro-Hungary, Dr. Victor Adler ; in the States, Eugene Debs and Daniel de Leon ; and in England, men of the type of Hyndman and Keir Hardie, John Burns, Wells and Webb, Bernard Shaw, and Robert Blatchford, were, each according to his ability and outlook, giving the new revelation to the world.

Despite their radical differences of idea and presentation, the thought, generally,

behind the brains of these men was that, first, a perfect citizen in our time was possible ; secondly, that to get the perfect citizen, all that was necessary was, much as the apostles of old had conceived it, to go out into the world and preach the gospel of Democracy—“ the gospel according to St. Marx,” as some of the ribald called it, although men like Hardie had, literally, nothing in common with the great German sociologist, either temperamentally or intellectually.

They were all, even those most vehemently denying, Utopians. They had no idea, could have no idea, of the tremendous nature of the task to which they had set themselves. And to say that they were Utopians is not to condemn but to praise. All the world’s reformers have been Utopians.

As one of these pioneers of the newer citizenship recently told the writer : “ A little over a generation ago, we in England could have put all the men who thought like us into a four-wheeled cab, but we believed we had only to go out to the street corner to bring all people to us.”

The Democratic Impulse in citizenship came at a time when a certain indifference possessed municipal politics generally. The

people of that time could not be bothered with such things as light and drains. For the superior people who spoke of stars and dwelt in another world, such things were too ordinary for attention—for the “inferior,” interested more in beer and horse-racing, such things had no existence.

The civic pioneers of the nineties, to whatever party they belonged, came to show the import of such things not only physically but spiritually, although many of them would have vigorously denied this last. Salvation by works! rather than by faith was their civic slogan. Both Liberals and Conservatives, as their opponents, were being forced to concentrate upon municipal politics and social reform.

Looking back upon those brave days, when new banners with sometimes more than strange devices were being flung to the breezes of public opinion, it is curious to reflect upon one of the strangest phenomena of our time, a phenomenon yet scarcely apprehended. It is curious to see how, as the democratic idea in citizenship has spread, not only throughout Europe and the United States but even in parts of Asia, and as the new principles have become diffused, and this applies particularly

to Great Britain, something has touched the hem of Democracy's garment, some at least of the virtue for the time seems to have gone out of her. Success is the acid-test.

We find that diffusion and permeation have meant loss of force and faith. Democracy in many countries is no longer preached so much as a faith, but, where it has not degenerated into a cult, rather as a practical means to a practical end. It is not that the idea of democracy is dying, or even dormant, it has simply reached one of those transition-waiting stages of all great movements when, unknown to its adherents, it is being profoundly modified.

One thing at least is beginning to make itself plain to those idealists who do not shut out fact—namely that in countries like Denmark and Germany, for example, where before the Great War the poverty problem had been practically solved for large sections of the working classes, well-fed stomachs have not necessarily led to idealism in thought, and that when citizenship has solved the economic problem it is only at the beginning of its task.

All of which is but to say that newer ideas are making themselves felt in the democracy

of our time and, with them, newer ideas of democratic citizenship.

It is not impossible that we are about to witness a violent reaction from the present materialist trend of democratic citizenship, and signs are not wanting that within the next few years we may see something in the nature of a new democratic movement finding its inspiration in religion.

Reference

“Il Principe,” Machiavelli.

(Although strong meat, Machiavelli’s famous book is given as throwing a flood of light upon the principle that is the antithesis of the democratic, and therefore, by implication, upon the democratic impulse itself.)

FEW people have any clear idea as to how they are governed. The study of citizenship implies a study of its framework, and, whilst it will be impossible to analyse the machinery of citizenship throughout the Old and New Worlds, which would need a book to itself, it will be possible, briefly, to take England's local-government methods of to-day for the purpose of gaining a general idea as to "how cities are governed."

If one had space, one would like to trace the rise and decline of civic activities and machinery in England prior to 1835, but here we shall have to be content with the more modern developments.

The main authorities in England and Wales, outside London, are Urban District Councils, Municipal Borough Councils, County Borough Councils, and, for London, the Metropolitan Borough Councils, which share with the London County Council, etc., the civic administration of the metropolis.

Everything that concerns each one of us as citizens, from the dustbin in the back yard to the rates we pay and the education of the community, is governed by one or other of these bodies.

Beginning with the Borough, of which there are 327 in England and Wales outside London, this is one of the most ancient as it is the most powerful of all English local-government units.

The borough to-day is an urban community which has received a Charter of Incorporation from the Crown and is governed by the Municipal Corporations Acts, 1835-1882. Some of these boroughs come down from the Middle Ages, some were created only yesterday. They vary in size, status, and constitution. Thus you have the Borough of Birmingham with 830,000 inhabitants and the borough of Winchelsea with but 700 inhabitants.

The student must be clear about the difference between the 80 County Boroughs and the non-County Boroughs. The County Borough, which in all but three cases is a town of over 50,000 inhabitants, stands, generally speaking, entirely upon itself administratively and outside the adminis-

trative county area of which geographically it forms a part. It has practically all the powers of a county council. The non-County borough, on the other hand, is not so powerful, and its authority in its area is divided with other authorities, such as the county council.

The Urban Districts, of which there are about 800, were established by the Local Government Act of 1894. The Urban District is less powerful than the Borough and has to share its authority with other bodies. It may become a "Municipal Borough," if it apply to the Privy Council for a Charter of Incorporation, its powers and facilities for raising money, etc., being accordingly increased. Municipal Boroughs and Urban Districts of more than 50,000 inhabitants may apply to become county boroughs with corresponding powers.

Incidentally, Parishes or Rural Districts, the councils of which are the authorities for the rural districts, may be converted into Urban Districts.

The determinative factor in such applications for conversion should be the question as to how far the nature and size of the district or borough justifies the greater powers.

The 28 Metropolitan Borough Councils

of the Metropolis, which were constituted under the London Government Act 1899 to replace the chaos of Vestries and Boards of Works which administered the 120 square miles of London, interact and co-operate with the London County Council, the Metropolitan Asylums Board, the Metropolitan Water Board, and the Port of London Authority, the titles of which indicate their scope.

Generally speaking, all the above have very wide powers, including all matters pertaining to Housing, Town-planning, Health, Education, Roads, Parks, Commons, Allotments, Libraries, Public Utility Services (gas, water, electricity, tramways, etc.), Child Labour, Factories and Workshops Control, Licensing Registration, Fire-prevention, Food Control, and, more recently, Health Insurance, Profiteering, Old Age Pensions, and Unemployment.

The Borough Council, which consists of a Mayor, Aldermen, and Councillors, takes an active part in the administration of justice, the Mayor, who is elected by the councillors, presiding over the Borough Bench. If over 10,000 in population, the Borough Council maintains its own police, something also that applies to certain municipal councils.

The principal revenue of all these councils is, roughly, drawn from one or other of the following sources: (1) income from property owned by the corporation or from municipal trading; (2) grants from the Imperial exchequer; and (3) rates, which they make and levy.

All these councils are corporate bodies with perpetual succession, their lives continuing unbroken regardless of the individual members who compose them, the councillors, who may be of either sex, sitting for three years, a third of the members usually retiring each year and being eligible for re-election. The elections are on the 1st November of each year for the Borough Councils and on the 1st November triennially for the Metropolitan Borough Councils, the whole number retiring every three years. The Urban District councillors use both methods of retirement.

The councils must be regarded on the one hand as agents for carrying into effect the bills passed by Parliament and, on the other, as being the nurseries of future legislators, so that constant action and reaction are going on between municipal and national politics. The present machinery is, however,

cumbersome, with a chaos of interlocking and overlapping authorities. It will be the business of the citizen of the future to simplify this machinery by perhaps combining strong centralisation of the motor force or brain, with equally strong decentralisation for the devolution of local powers, so securing something of that civic flexibility which is the ideal. The nearer civic administration approaches the model of the human body, that is, with brain directing members, the better.

The Poor Law, which dates from 1601, is administered by Boards of Guardians, for to-day the councillor has replaced the priest in this connection. Those students who would delve more deeply into the case for the opponents of what has been described as "a vast machine for dealing with the destitute by deterring them from getting relief as long as possible," and by its friends as "an imperfect machine in an imperfect world," might study the Minority Report of the Poor Law Commission of 1905-9.

The import of these various bodies may be realised by remembering that British Local Government spends to-day practically the same amount that the National Govern-

ment used to spend in times of peace ; levies upon the citizen nearly as much in direct taxation and with the 1920 "lift" in rates of 5s., 6s., and 7s. in the £, probably more than the national government used to levy as "the King's Taxes ;" employs nearly twice as many people as, leaving the army and navy on one side, all the centralised government departments together ; is responsible for far more enterprises than the National Government (apart from war services) ; and even enacts, year in, year out, almost as great a volume of legislation, and obligatory legislation so far as the citizen is concerned, as Parliament itself.

Of local authorities, there are some 30,000 at work, and the distinguishing characteristic of these is their freedom from central executive control. Within the limits of the statutory powers conferred on them, the local authority, responsible only to the local electorate, may administer local affairs as it pleases, and can "strike" its rates also as it pleases. The big lift in local taxation of recent years is due first, to the increased cost of all means of life, and then to the forced levies laid upon local authorities by the Government for vast schemes like those

of education, housing, etc. The breaking-point has now almost been reached, however, and we are likely to see a peaceful revolt of citizens by refusing to pay the local rates, etc., and by a general demand for a national audit for the purpose of finding out exactly what has been spent in rates, how it has been spent, and how to reduce the expenditure.

This is the immediate task facing the citizenship of to-day.

References

- “Minority Report of the Poor Law Commission.”
(Fabian Society, 1909.)
- “The Commonsense of Municipal Trading,” G. Bernard Shaw, 1912. (Fabian Society.)
- “English Public Health Administration,” B. G. Bannington, 1915. (King:)
- “The Reorganisation of Local Government,” C. M. Lloyd, 1919. (Fabian Society.)

*A Generation Ago—and To-day, or
Municipal Trading v. Private Enterprise* X

the economic side, the issue around which the citizenship of our day is revolving is that of Municipal Trading versus Private Enterprise. Even a generation ago, municipal enterprise had begun to find itself. To-day, it threatens private enterprise as a serious competitor in many fields and is constantly enlarging its sphere and variety.

A comparison of the two periods will be helpful.

All this is helping in the transference of citizenship from the purely political to the economic plane; is breaking down party politics; and subtly but inevitably is leading to the transformation of twentieth-century society, first on the civic plane, then on the national.

The point involved is simply: "Can the private enterprise of the individual trader and administrator provide the community with its gas, water, railways, houses, etc.,

cheaper and better than the community itself can provide them by municipal trading under officials ? ”

The individualist citizen will reply : “ Yes.”
The collectivist : “ No.”

Only, both the “ Yes ” and the “ No ” were much more emphatic a generation ago, when municipal enterprise was more or less on its trial. To-day, even the individualist generally admits the advantages of municipal enterprise in certain fields, whilst the municipaliser is not quite so dogmatic in his claims.

What one feels, rightly or wrongly, is that the problems of interference with the liberty of the subject, etc., which to-day appear to us almost insuperable, will seem simple to our descendants, who will find a golden mean between things which primarily concern the individual and those which primarily concern the community, although, in the deepest sense, anything that concerns the one concerns the other.

The writer will put, briefly and neutrally, the pros and cons of public ownership, generally as they are argued to-day and have been argued for the past twenty years.

Those in favour of private enterprise contend :

1. That its economic and productive efficiency is greater than that of municipal enterprise.
2. That municipal enterprise does not attract men of the first class.
3. That in countries like the United States, where the city administrations are so often accused of lack of *morale*, bribery and corruption get a much greater chance than under private enterprise.
4. That private ownership being financially more successful than public, it can and does pay more taxes to the government than publicly owned plants bring into the city.

Those in favour of municipal enterprise urge that :

1. A public plant does not have to pay dividends upon watered stock, nor on the actual investment, nor interest.
2. It does not have to advertise or solicit business.
3. It saves by combination with other departments of public service.
4. Where municipal enterprise has to borrow, it can borrow cheaper than private.
5. There is a big saving in the amounts

paid to the heads, who do not draw what a wealthy private employer draws out of his private business.

6. Public plants gain in efficiency through better paid and contented labour, so saving costly strikes and lock-outs, and accidents are fewer.

7. Municipal enterprises develop civic interest in the people who, being directly concerned through the rates in municipal ownership, are less likely to waste water, electricity, etc., knowing that such waste will have to come out of their own pockets, all this making for a greater sense of communal life.

8. The actual figures of private and municipal undertakings, offering the same services under identical conditions, prove conclusively that men will do better work at a cheaper rate when working for the public good than when working for private gain.

9. The feeling, despite their drawbacks, is given by all governmental institutions of confidence and that nobody is "out to make something."

Perhaps one of the best ways of grasping the rise and development of municipal enter-

prise and the increasing concern of citizenship with houses, gas, water, etc., under the machinery of to-day as before outlined, is to take a rapid review of the position of municipal enterprise from, say, 15 to 25 years ago, not only nationally in the various European countries as in America, but in their principal cities, at the time when its pros and cons were being violently and even acrimoniously discussed, comparing that time briefly with to-day.

This will not only give us a clearer grip upon the differences involved than we could get if we only considered the present, when the original issues are blurred, but will show the beginnings of to-day's vast municipal undertakings and the metamorphosis of civic enterprise.

One of the first things with which the enquiring student is faced where economic questions are concerned, and human nature being what it is, is the difficulty of getting "facts." What he is likely to get is *some* facts, not *the* facts. On either side we find "special pleading," the more effective that it is often unconscious.

As a matter of history it may be stated that municipal trading originated, not with

the Socialists, but rather with the commercial and mercantile classes. It had already made much headway before labour raised its voice in local affairs.

Generally, private enterprise in all countries expresses itself to-day in favour of municipal enterprise in all "non-competitive" undertakings such as gas, water, and lighting, whilst opposing its employment in the competitive field in such activities as municipal banking, insurance, housing, etc. But even this opposition has been modified of later years.

Municipal enterprise, whether for good or ill, has come to stay, and nobody would any more dream of abolishing it completely than, for example, in England of turning the post office over to private hands.

How fast it has progressed is shown by the fact that in Great Britain by 1907 about three-fourths of the waterworks were owned by local authorities and more than half the gas supply outside of London had been municipalised. By that time also more than half the electric-lighting plants belonged to municipalities and about half the tramways. From 1894 to 1906 the advance had been so rapid that the tramways operated by muni-

cipalities rose from 2 per cent. to nearly 50 per cent.

The same progress also holds good for the United States, where, in 1881, there was only one public electric-lighting plant. By 1908 there were 1,097.

It should be remembered that for all municipal activities in Great Britain the Town Council has become the supreme legislative and executive authority.

During the nineties and in the first few years of the present century, the citizen of both the Old and New Worlds had been definitely educated to the municipal idea in citizenship.

The writer, who spent some years in the Scandinavian countries as well as a considerable time in Holland, will have to content himself with a brief comment upon the progress of the municipal, or, at least, co-operative idea in the civic activities of those countries.

In Holland, whilst at the time of his visit poor relief was mainly in the hands of the churches and private societies, all were compelled to report to the government. Beggars and tramps were treated as criminals, being placed upon conviction in State work-institutions, although, incidentally, Rotterdam boasts more child-beggars than the

writer has seen in almost any other European country. Yet the Dutch cities, as a whole, give an impression of extraordinary order and cleanliness.

In Sweden, where there has recently been, from a persistent mediævalism, a great surge towards democratic institutions, the municipalities enjoy much freedom in their local affairs, co-operation spreading rapidly, and largely forming the nucleus around which Swedish citizenship is building itself. There is a steady tendency towards public ownership of the railways, telephones, and telegraphs. In Norway, co-operation has also made considerable headway.

In Denmark, however, municipal action and co-operation reach their highest point.

Denmark was one of the first countries to give women the vote, and women take a prominent part in public administration locally and in Parliament (the Danish *Folke-thing*), there having been for many years women members of parliament. In Copenhagen, there is what is perhaps the finest system in Europe of dealing with the aged poor, homes being established for them and no stigma of pauperism attaching to those who live in them, the inmates being regarded

as State pensioners. The capital is also in the forefront of that later development in civic administration which insists upon immediate report to and control by the municipality of infectious and contagious diseases, such report being followed by municipal disinfection.

As is well known, Denmark has done more than almost any other country in advancing the ideas of the co-operative movement throughout the world, combining with co-operation a high standard of individualism and education.

In fact this country has for the student of citizenship a special significance and would well repay a visit, especially if he or she is interested in the ideal of "individualist-co-operation" put forward in these pages and towards which the citizenship of the world would seem to be moving. Not least is the Dane of interest because in Denmark for very many years there has been not only a nominal but actual equality of the sexes, no Dane being so ignorant as to regard the woman as inferior to her mate.

Three main channels of municipal activity in all countries during the last twenty to thirty years will, for lack of space, have to be

dismissed in a few paragraphs. That is, housing, municipal markets and slaughter-houses, and the municipal milk supply, or, as they have been called, the three pillars of citizenship.

In London, the Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1890, made possible the condemnation of large slum areas, vast housing schemes being carried out both there and in the principal British cities, as well as in many of the smaller towns.

In the United States, the writer has seen some of the most complete and best arranged popular housing schemes, inaugurated, however, chiefly under the auspices of private housing companies, whilst in Germany, vast housing schemes have largely worked out on municipal lines, the State in some cases financing such schemes. It was private action, however, which first started German housing reform. The whole question received much impetus from the formation of the German National Housing Council in 1904.

Austria and Switzerland, prior to the war, had been slowly following the German channels.

In France, from the nineties, co-operative building societies have played a large part

in housing-citizenship, one typical French development being the *maisons des enfants* idea—i.e., societies letting *only* to families with children blocks of flats specially arranged for the little ones. In the opinion of many modern Frenchmen, seriously concerned by the terrible male death-roll in the war as by the steadily decreasing birth-rate, citizenship of this kind alone can save France—municipal rather than national citizenship.

Belgium has also done fine work through the lending of money by the Savings Bank of Belgium to building societies.

Much of the preceding also applies to the markets and abattoirs which, not only in England, but throughout Europe, are largely municipal, France leading the way and Germany to-day having them in every city, even the smallest. Denmark, however, would seem to have brought this side of municipal enterprise to the highest pitch of development, its meat and food arrangements being as nearly perfect as civic control can make them.

Both Paris and Copenhagen, recognising the intimate connection between bad milk and infant mortality, had a perfect milk supply inaugurated over a decade ago under

stringent control, especially the latter city, and the movement has taken root in most European countries as in America. Although the milk supply of the United Kingdom, both in quality and cleanliness, still continues to be a public disgrace, municipal milk depots for infants have been established in various places, the first at St. Helens, Lancashire, in 1899. Of the 800,000 babies born each year in England and Wales, 100,000 die before one year, but at least 60,000 of these might be saved, according to the authorities, if the proper milk were given.

In the countries under review as in others, and particularly in Denmark and Germany, steady progress has been made towards increased control by Boards of Health of infectious and contagious diseases, report to and disinfection of house and person by the civic authorities being generally compulsory. It is a principle which in the next decade is likely to be extended in all countries to that scourge of the white race—venereal disease, the notification of which one day will be made compulsory. Citizenship, and citizenship alone, can by education sterilise vice at its source and so solve this appalling modern problem.

All these activities showed, generally, ordered progress up to the war of 1914, which, by the unique facilities for the compilation of data, etc. (for instance, the national figures as to physical deterioration), to which it gave rise, has in some ways rendered advanced experiments in citizenship possible. These activities are now beginning once more to get into their stride and we may fairly confidently look forward to similar even growth and progression in the future along co-operative lines.

Looking now at the various cities of the world, taking each as a separate unit, one can get another angle of view on the advance of municipal enterprise and co-operation during the last few decades.

Beginning with London, the world's largest city, one may remark that London had no unity of government until 1855, when a comprehensive system of local administration was provided for the parishes. From 1855 to 1888 great strides were made in the direction of public control. Since the passing of the Local Government Act in 1888, more than 200 measures have been placed on the statute book extending the powers of the County Council, the London Government

Act of 1899 creating the metropolitan borough councils.

The main lines of municipal activity in London are water, electric supply, lighting, gas, tramways, housing, and education, and it may not unfairly be claimed that the decrease in the death-rate from 21.6 per 1,000 in 1881 to 16.1 in 1904 (in 1919 it was 13.4) was largely due to the attempts made during that period to solve the overcrowding problem and to municipal effort generally.

The nature of the problem is indicated by the fact that, according to the authority, Charles Booth, "in London, one person in every four will die in the workhouse, hospital, or lunatic asylum." Which is sufficient comment upon what remains to be and can be accomplished by the citizenship of the future, which will concern itself largely with the saving of the citizen in embryo—that is, the child, and it will do this by first saving the mother. That this terrible indictment of our civilisation can be wiped out is shown by the opinion of the best scientific pre-war authorities that between 80 and 90 per cent. of all children born in Great Britain are born healthy.

The chief divisions of the powers and

duties of the London County Council may be made under three heads : first, the raising, borrowing, and loaning of money ; secondly, the granting of music, theatre and dancing licences ; the provision of asylums and other public buildings ; and the control of traffic and drainage, streets, housing, and public health ; and thirdly, new powers in regard to the registration of voters, etc.

It is of interest to note that from 1889 to 1904 London had a substantial "Progressive" or "municipal enterprise" majority, whilst the 1907 elections gave the Moderates a "private enterprise" majority. At the time of writing the Progressives are entrenched.

One of the most instructive stories for those who would realise the peculiar problems facing the modern city councillor is the story of the three great American cities—New York, Chicago, and San Francisco. The intimate intrigue of politics with civic affairs ; the formation and breaking of "rings" and monopolies ; the vice commissions ; the bribery and corruption which the best Americans have done so much to expose and destroy—all this forms as exciting a story as any ever told by novelist.

The American cities are here especially

mentioned because, being a new country, with all the faults and virtues of youth, the evils of the European city appear in more concentrated form in that of the New World, which is really a very old world, offering many interesting and exact parallels to Babylon, Rome, and Greece.

In New York, owing to its enclosure by the three rivers, housing has been one of the most vital problems, forcing the erection of the giant skyscrapers and leading to a number of labour-saving appliances which in scope and ingenuity have no equal on the planet. The Americans, with some of the Scandinavians, are amongst the few who have recognised how important to good citizenship, and especially to feminine citizenship, is the solution of the domestic work problem.

Also, no people have specialised more in the tenement and transport sides of citizenship than the New Yorkers, and, in spite of the many ugly sides of the story of the American cities, the writer believes that it is largely to America Europe must look for the newer citizenship.

The Americans are a young people, therefore receptive. They are afraid of nothing, not

even of new ideas. They make mistakes. But they do things.

The story of American citizenship is largely that of municipal reform—at first isolated risings of angry citizens sinking political party differences to oust some corrupt administration or destroy corrupt rings like that of the notorious Tammany; later, developing into permanent organisations, and, later still, into the Law and Order Leagues which sprang up in the eighties and nineties, as into organisations like the Municipal Voters' League of Chicago and other cities, these finally uniting into a National Municipal League.

To-day, civic enterprise in America is making enormous advance, and that despite a certain wave of individualist reaction which showed itself here and there after the Great War. In his visit to the States in 1919, the writer was particularly struck by the increasing and vital interest taken in civic affairs by both sexes in the various cities he visited.

Municipal enterprise in both electric lighting and gas has been largely on the increase in America, Richmond, Virginia, constructing the first municipal gasworks in 1852. Virginia was also responsible for the first municipal

waterworks—in 1800. By 1905 there were nearly 60 per cent. municipally owned water-works in the U.S.A. The experiment of substituting municipal for private enterprise has been almost everywhere successful.

Paris has a unique system of municipal organisation, necessitated by its being the most densely populated of the white world's great cities, having, before the war, 117 persons to the acre as opposed to Berlin's 85, New York's 60, and London's 51. Alone amongst French cities, Paris has no mayor, the city being virtually ruled by two prefects, municipal ownership of public utilities being well developed, the city owning all markets, slaughter-houses, and cattle-yards, and having a splendid Board of Health with a department for "Public Assistance."

As may be expected, pre-war Germany showed in its cities one of the strongest examples of municipal enterprise, exercised under a machine-like system of paternal bureaucracy, modern social reform in Germany having its roots, characteristically, in the philosophies of Hegel and Fichte, these in their turn naturally following the German conception in the Middle Ages of a Christian paternal state.

In Berlin and other cities, lodging-houses are provided for the needy, the poor relief being under strict municipal control, the care of the poor being a legal obligation, Germany originating the famous Elberfeld preventative system against poverty, appointing unpaid "honour officials," making them guardians of cases and giving them certain districts to watch—so saving much money by relieving want in its early stages.

The franchise before the war for city elections divided all males over 24 into three classes according to the taxes they paid—just as Solon had done it in Attica 2,500 years before.

Public ownership has gone very far in lighting, water, sewage, tramways, etc.

Pre-war Germany is noticeable for one thing—the co-operation of voluntary action with State aid under State supervision. And to Germany is primarily due all those later experiments in national working-class insurance which to-day, in England and elsewhere, are playing so large a part in public life.

The writer who, before the war, visited some thirteen German cities was much struck by the extraordinary centralised control exercised by the municipalities of various cities, the

factory, housing, and business districts being conformed to their special needs and building sites utilised to secure a maximum of light and air. Public buildings, swimming baths, recreation centres, were all municipally controlled, municipal building taking the initiative and influencing private enterprise, surely a reversal of the accepted view.

The larger cities had hygienic institutes where all public-health questions could be studied, the mortality, he was told, decreasing from between 35 and 40 per thousand in the seventies to 20 per thousand in 1907, after which year it remained fairly constant. Since the war, this mortality has of course largely increased owing to Germany's enfeebled condition. Special courses in crafts are given, many cities maintaining bureaux for legal information. All cities own their water-works.

Everywhere, throughout the Fatherland, the local authorities before the war retained expert economists, who were and probably are constantly considering and revising the social, industrial, and economic problems before the cities in every phase of human progress.

And yet one is bound to say that this

paternal bureaucracy seemed to secure material well-being at the expense of other and individual qualities and brought vividly to the eye-witness the intense complexity of the problems which face the civic reformer, who has to consider not only the physical but the spiritual in his solutions, and which is one reason why Germany has here been referred to at some length.

But in all this what we are witnessing is the steady trend for European and American citizenship to take housing and all similar activities of direct public interest out of the hands of the private speculator. Wherever the issue is one between the city and the individual, the individual is being forced to give way.

For good or ill, the democratic impulse is the dominant influence in the citizenship of our day and generation.

References

- “Life and Labour of the People in London,” Charles Booth.
- “Modern Housing in Town and Country” (London 1905), Jas. Cornes.
- “Public Health and Housing” (London, 1901), Sykes.
- “Reports of Tenement-House Commissions, American Economic Association Publications,” viii., No. 2-3.

“Compte Rendu et Documents (1900) of the Congrès Internationale des Habitations à Bon Marché.”

“Infantile Mortality and Infants’ Milk Depots,” G. F. McCleary, M.D., 1905.

“The Control of the Milk Supply,” Dr. Newman (“British Medical Journal,” 1904).

“Infant Mortality,” Dr. G. Newman (1907).

MAN, the Utopian, has, throughout history, been ceaseless in his search for the perfect community and the perfect citizen, from that now 2,000-years-old experiment of the idealistic community of the Essenes, based upon communism, down to our own times. Again and yet again he has attempted to form "ideal communities," which have only failed for one reason—the reason that the men and women composing them have not been "ideal."

That is the point.

If we are from the outset clear that no lawgiver, however wise, and no city councillor, however enlightened, can advance one inch beyond the understanding of the community, we shall have a compass for our citizenship. Great men who are, as we say, "before their time," have given and must give "a lead" to the great average. But that lead can only be successful in so far as the average man and

woman through education and development can assimilate it.

The only justification for Democracy lies in the instinctive capacity of the collective consciousness to elect as its leaders and councillors men and women superior to the average, that is, to itself, and without which civilisation could never have come into being. The government by inferior people of inferior people who have elected them is better than the forcible government of inferiors by self-appointed superiors against the will of the governed.

The essential of all advance in citizenship is that it shall be voluntary, that the communal consciousness shall unfold itself like a flower from its own hidden powers. The only alternative would seem to be the Nietzschean theory of the Superman reigning over slaves.

It is indeed true that the majority is always wrong and always right! It is wrong in the sense that all advance comes from minorities, in the first instance from individuals. It is right in that, through the instinct to which we have referred, it works out true in time.

One could easily obtain a mechanically perfect community in which everything was ordered like clockwork by superior people.

But the last state of that community would be worse than the first. It would be a machine without a soul. It would mean the triumph of that collectivist autocracy of the official than which there is nothing conceivably more hideous.

What social reformers, especially of the collectivist school, are always forgetting, is that a system of co-operation, to successfully replace that of the present one of competition, would need an immeasurably higher standard of education and unselfishness than anything we know or perhaps can conceive to-day.

These mechanical attempts to leap the centuries by securing civic perfection without the spade-work of education and that idealism which springs from a combination of idealism and self-discipline, have been particularly frequent in our times, and have been usually based upon communism. The author of one of the first of the communist group of experiments was Robert Owen, the famous social reformer and writer, born in Wales in 1771, who formed the New Harmony colony in Indiana in 1825.

The objects of the society as set out were that "all the members shall be considered as members of one family" and that all were to

share alike in food, clothing, education, etc. And then the inevitable Utopian: "Every member shall render his or her best services for the good of the whole."

There was in fact complete communism, or having all things in common, which was secured under a curiously involved system of bureaucratic control, officials being appointed over the various departments.

For a year the community went well, but in 1827, after splitting several times, the parent society dissolved.

Owen tried a similar settlement, called Queenwood, at Tytherly, Hampshire, in 1840. It started, like the other, full of promise, but in 1844 was faced with a heavy financial deficit and melted away in the following year.

Another experiment was that of Orbiston, initiated near Glasgow in 1826 by Abram Combe with the help of two or three other sympathetic capitalists. The objects of the Orbiston Community were practically the same as those of New Harmony and Queenwood, the care and education of the children being a charge on the community. By 1827 the community seemed assured of success, having made excellent roads, laid out good gardens, and having an iron foundry which

was doing well. The members seemed remarkably happy.

Yet within a few months it had broken up on the death of its founder, Combe.

The reasons for these failures are not far to seek. They were, roughly, contained in the criticisms of Aristotle some two thousand years before of the most thorough and comprehensive scheme of Communism ever put forward—that contained in the fifth book of Plato's "Republic."

Aristotle says that this scheme could not succeed because :

Firstly, the distribution of the common property will be a perpetual source of dispute, members protesting that they are not receiving in proportion to their worth.

Secondly, compulsory association with others will not bring harmony, but friction.

Thirdly, common property, inasmuch as it belongs to nobody in particular, will be apt to be neglected by everybody.

Fourthly, unless the community is very small, there will be no real self-government by the members.

Owen's schemes, all of which showed a tendency to revert to individualism as time went on, failed for precisely these reasons.

But they failed also, as all similar experiments to-day are doomed to failure, because the men and women composing them, of all types and developments, had not yet evolved to the point of self-sacrifice when the spur of the competitive system was no longer necessary. It was, once more, a case of human nature.

And they failed because the founder, a man of excellent intentions, who, an arch-materialist, in his belief in the effect of environment upon the individual, antedated Karl Marx, thought it possible to superimpose a superior system upon inferior people. As he himself once said, in explaining his personal autocracy in relation to his communities : "We must consent to be ruled by despots until we have sufficient knowledge to govern ourselves," which indeed is identical with Lenin's own contention to-day in Bolshevik Russia in excuse for the iron autocracy into which his original democratic communism has passed, that "liberty is a bourgeois superstition."

It is not for us to sneer at such materialistic pioneers as Robert Owen, for we are learning one of the first lessons of all good citizens—that all brave thinkers, however varying in

thought and ideal, are, like ourselves, travellers on the road of life. It is for us to help, not to hinder, one another.

The famous Oneida Community, founded in 1848 by John H. Noyes at Oneida, Madison County, New York, originally being the Perfectionist Community, started by him in 1836 and transferred from Putney, Vermont, was also based upon the most complete communism.

For the first nine years the community was not successful financially, but afterwards its property increased in value by the partial replacement of gardening and farming by mechanical industries, especially that of animal-trap manufacture. In the year 1880 it became a joint-stock corporation, the Oneida Community, Limited, being now managed by a board of eleven directors and manufacturing silk, silver-plated ware, and canned goods in its various American factories. Up to pre-war times, it had been paying about 6 or 7 per cent. on its stock and retained some features at least of the former society such as common grounds, common library and assembly room, common dining-room, etc.

But one is forced to point out that it has only been by entering the competitive market

and becoming "capitalised" that this community has been rendered financially successful. Which is not to say that a segregated community, "producing for use and not for profit," although set in the heart of capitalist society, could not be a success given certain necessary factors.

In its earlier years the community possessed the most radical system of communism that has been attempted in any experiment in citizenship. It concentrated upon education and there was no drunkenness, tobacco-using or profanity amongst its members, whilst it won the esteem of its neighbours by its perfect integrity in business affairs.

It had two interesting institutions, one, that of mutual criticism or "heart to heart talks," when the members met to criticise and be criticised as to character, acts, and influence. The other, that of "complex marriage," which they claimed to be superior to monogamy and which has apparently been explained in varying ways by different representatives of the community, from something practically indistinguishable from monogamy to polygamy. But, in deference to public opinion, this was replaced by ordinary monogamous marriage in 1879.

Amongst other experiments of a similar type, most of them American, and some of them, it must be admitted, successful but largely without that phenomenon of growth which is the prime condition of life, are those which gave rise to the fifteen societies of the Shakers, founded in 1776, now disappearing; the Anabaptists founded in Germany in the sixteenth century and still persisting; the Swedish Community founded in 1856 and lasting sixteen years; the Community of Israelites, having about 1,000 members, and growing; the still existing Amana Community founded in 1843 near Buffalo, now numbering some 2,000 members, having seven villages, all under one control; the German Seventh-Day Baptists, founded nearly 200 years ago in Pennsylvania, now disappearing; the Brook-Farm Community, founded in Massachusetts in 1842 by cultured people; some thirty Fourieristic colonies, lasting from a few months to seventeen years, founded upon the principles of Fourier, which were formed in five years in eight different American States, and which, despite their many excellences, really proposed to inaugurate upon earth a sort of clockwork heaven; and several spiritualistic communities.

In addition to these, a mass of communities, commonwealths, brotherhoods, and co-operative settlements have sprung up mushroom-like within the last twenty years throughout America, the great forcing-ground for such experiments, including the Christian Commonwealth of Georgia, the Ruskin Commonwealth of Tennessee and Georgia; the Co-operative Brotherhood of Burley, Washington; the Equality Colony; the Industrial Single-Tax Association; and the Woman's Commonwealth of Washington City, the names of which convey their scope and the existence of which, however fanciful and unpractical many of them may be, is eloquent testimony to a growing desire for a finer and nobler citizenship.

The various experiments mentioned above, as well as those which have been started in other parts of Europe and the States, may be roughly divided into (1) the religious; (2) the non-religious; and (3) the ethical. As a matter of record, the religious communities lead the others in longevity as in general success, a point which is of interest to those social reformers who believe that religion is the foe of social advance.

But of all these experiments it may be

said that they have been inspired by the conviction that all that is bad in society lies in institutions and not in men and women, and by a pathetic if rather beautiful belief in the natural perfection of human beings, here and now. And there would seem to be in them this much truth—that no man can say how far an effort to change a particular institution or system by intelligent and inspired leaders may not awake in those less intelligent and inspired a suppressed or unconscious desire for better things. But even this needs careful preparation and training beforehand.

What has to be observed of these experiments is that they continue to exist only at the price of, firstly, living out of the world as specialised communities of men and women of the same type, or, secondly, of "making friends with the mammon of unrighteousness" they abhor by trading, etc., under the individualist system of competition. It is purchased, in other words, at the cost of co-operation and living one's life fully and socially with one's fellows, that is to say, at the cost of the very principle upon which such communities are founded.

They represent, sociologically, the placing of a piece of new cloth in an old garment.

But, as they are always finding out, there is no short cut to the New Jerusalem. The road of citizenship is a long, often painful, road, but it does get somewhere.

Communism can include the most widely differing concepts of citizenship, from pure anarchy to State Socialism. Communists may be Anarchist-Communists, or Syndicalists, Guild Socialists or State Socialists. That is, they may believe in either the sovereignty of the individual or of the State. They may say that the citizen has the right to order his own life apart from his fellows, or that the State has the right, as the old Greeks with the German pre-war Junkers held, to order each item of the life of its citizens. And between these two communist extremes there exists, of course, every stage of mean.

In view of the Anarchist concept of citizenship, first expounded by the originator of the famous "Property is theft," Proudhon, in 1848, having within the last two generations found so many adherents throughout the world, especially in Russia, the home of anarchy, it will be well here perhaps to show what that concept means.

Of course the reader will know that the

superstition that the anarchist is necessarily a long-haired, bomb-throwing individual is only a superstition. He may be a bomb-thrower, but he is just as likely to be a pacifist.

The word "anarchy" is derived from two Greek words meaning "anti-government," and is the doctrine of the abolition of the government of man by man and the institution of society without government, to which men like Rousseau, Proudhon, and others have contributed, but which was first formulated into a movement by Bakounin, the Russian revolutionist, who, after the Socialist International was founded in London under the presidency of Karl Marx in 1864, threw himself into the movement and almost captured it for anarchism in the Latin countries, Switzerland, etc.

The anarchist-communist concept of citizenship implies in the first place that all things belong to all and that in a perfectly ordered city or State the distribution of goods, etc. will be "from each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs," which indeed is the Socialist conception itself. Like all anarchy, it seeks first and above all else to secure the absolute liberty of the individual.

All anarchists combat the word "democracy," because, in their eyes, democracy means the tyranny of the majority over the minority or individual. According to Proudhon, it is liberty that the citizen seeks in government, and the very essence of citizenship is liberty.

Yet all these statements are but so many pious aspirations. They are only words—words—words.

In the anarchist-communist community, there is to be no government in any sense of the word, only what is called "free association" of the citizens, upon the lines laid down by the well-known anarchist thinker, Stirner, who called them "Leagues of Egoists," who will come together for common purposes when it pleases them and break up when that common purpose has been accomplished or when it suits the individual citizen. In other words, there is to be no "State" and no discipline.

Prince Peter Kropotkin, the foremost living exponent of anarchist-communism, for example, foresees the day when "millions and millions of groups will freely constitute themselves for the satisfaction of all the varied needs of human beings."

Anarchist-communism foresees the citizen

of the future "emancipated from the governmental yoke," freely developing in groups and federations of his own freewill, with "free organisation ascending from the simple to the complex; emancipation from religious authority; and free morality without compulsion or authority developing itself from social life and becoming habitual." And it proposes to use force, if necessary, to change the present system.

It is here referred to at this length because what would seem to be one of the roots of the Russian character is just this anarchist-communist tendency as exemplified in the thought of Tolstoy and other Russian reformers, and because, within the next hundred years, Russia, falling away from the Bolshevik concept, is likely to initiate a new series of experiments in citizenship and groupings which may be of profound import to the world. Russia is one of the two great nurseries of new ideas in citizenship. The other is the United States.

Just a little digression here.

Anarchist-communism, which is drawn largely from the working classes, must not be confused with its opposite—"Individualist or Philosophical Anarchism," which is not

communist, believes in private property, is against force, and is drawn from the intellectual classes, whilst, unlike the other, it is not a class movement. The only thing they have in common is that both are opposed to the official or the State. They have in common with the Spencerian "first principle of human happiness" that of "equal freedom," which means: "Every man is free to do what he wills provided he infringes not the equal freedom of any other man," all of which bears that stamp of Utopianism which we have met again and again in the preceding pages.

The student will do well to note this stamp, so characteristic of the fanatical idealist of every school. Idealism so often seems to think it has only to wish, to have—to believe that words or phrases are the "open Sesame" to perfection—that to change the system is to change the individual.

Our next division of communism, Syndicalism (from the French for "trade union"—*syndicat*) can be treated in a few lines. Syndicalism has met its greatest success in the Latin countries. It believes that the future citizenship will come in a tremendous revolution in which the State is to disappear

and the control of all material things pass into the hands of the Trade Unions—the land, the mines, the workshops—all are to be administered in some as yet undefined way for the good of the community, perhaps under that loose federation of communes based upon the confederacies of citizens formed in the mediæval towns and cities, the restoration of which was largely the object of the rising of the Paris Commune in 1871. (These communes had their origin in the first representative assembly in history—the provincial *concilium* or *commune* of the Roman Empire.)

Under such a system, the trade unions of a city would take over that city's administration. Whether they would be free from a centralised national trade union control would depend upon whether the centralisation or decentralisation idea, about which the syndicalists have contested as fiercely as their Roman forbears, won.

The syndicalist is as much opposed to Collectivism (i.e. organisation of the community under State officials) as he is to the Capitalist competitive system. Many syndicalists, like the anarchist-communists, stand for "free association," which to the average

mind would seem to inhibit order or discipline in society. The syndicalism of Italy and France is the blood-relation of the Soviet.

(The French Revolution, incidentally, had nothing to do with Communism, the cry of "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity" being purely individualist.)

The concept of the State Socialist is simply the idea of the supremacy of the State over the individual, as opposed to its antithesis, the anarchist concept. It contemplates, generally, a strongly centralised government and the election of all officials by the people, nationally and locally, who will administer the different public departments from parliament to gas. It would, in the cities, replace private enterprise entirely by municipal enterprise, would, naturally, abolish the principle of private property and institute a benevolent bureaucracy founded, strictly, upon economic grounds, which ultimately would probably differ little from the paternalism of pre-war Germany. Religion would be a private matter, the enormous effect of religion upon citizenship being more or less ignored by the State Socialist, unless, as is not infrequently the case, in the Anglo-Saxon countries at least, he is himself personally religious.

“The International” concept of citizenship, as that of State Socialism is generally known, has found its chief demonstration in the millions (at one time about eleven millions of voters alone, but actually nearer fifty millions, if one includes all Socialists) of the “International,” or the Trades Unions and Socialist Societies of the world, united, nominally at least, under a central executive, the International Socialist Bureau, sitting for many years at Brussels, and moved during the war to the Hague and Stockholm, but now to meet in London. The idea is ultimately to unite the working-classes of the world, the term “working-class” now to include workers either with hand or brain, and form a world-citizenship, irrespective of colour, creed, or class. In a sense, this new interpretation of the term “workman” destroys the old “class-war.”

An actual society, calling themselves “Citizens of the World,” and now, the writer believes, defunct, and formed during the last decade, was an interesting sign of the new tendency.

Based upon “the materialist conception of history” of Karl Marx, the whole trend of the International has hitherto been towards

a materialist scheme of society, although the materialist outlook has often, consciously or unconsciously, concealed spiritual ends and embraced large numbers of anti-materialists.

The great war has however shown the essential differences in concept and method and has to-day led to a conflict which has split the outcome of the original or First International of Marx, that is, the Second International, into two parts, one part being more or less of the old orthodoxy, the other being the Moscow International, now called the Third International, based upon the Russian Bolshevik idea, already, itself, so profoundly modified, and we are now further probably about to see a drastic cleavage between the materialist and anti-materialist State Socialists.

It is the natural and indeed inevitable reaction to what to many seems a soulless system of officialdom, and the endeavour to reconcile the rights of the individual with those of the community, that has led to the impulse to the Guild Socialist ideal, which we are now to consider, and which, in a word, seeks to fling the twentieth century back into the Middle Ages, restore the old Guilds, and administer the towns and cities, as

society generally, by and through them, using the modern trade union as the basis for the change.

Most of the modern experiments of democracy have regarded society as an organisation of *consumers*, the problem being how to secure a more equitable distribution. The Guild idea of citizenship regards it primarily as an organisation of *producers*. The idea is much the same as the vague Syndicalism that is to base all civic and national organisation upon the Trade Unions, under a system of communism, the object being for the workers, whether of hand or brain, *to control their own work*. Incidentally it is this new impulse towards control, which, often under other names, has been at the back of the Shop Stewards' movement as at the back of the lightning world-strikes following the heels of war, which is the thing that makes it of such immediate importance to the student. Already in America the Photo-Engravers' Union have directly attempted to dictate terms of credit and prices to the employers, so seeking to control their industry. That attempt marks the passage from unconsciousness to consciousness and is a milestone in industrial history.

The Guild idea is really a new-old conception of democracy, differing radically from all modern democratic systems. It regards the idea of representation of the individual by elected individuals as nonsense, as it says that man is so constituted that he cannot be represented. But it is not against representative government, only it must be what the guildsman calls "real representation."

Such "real representation," he maintains, is not the representation of *persons* but that of *purposes* which men have in common. He contends that you ought never to try to represent Jones or Smith or Brown by means of Robinson, but that if the first three have a common interest in some particular thing, whether it be pianoforte manufacture or football-playing, it is right that they should choose Robinson to represent them in this common interest.

In fact, the whole idea of Guild citizenship is that the citizen should not be represented as an individual, as he is to-day and as he would be under State Socialism, but as a member of a group of interests. It aims at controlling society from the economic side only, but it believes that not the Guilds, but the community as a whole, should fix prices,

so doing away with the capitalist system of free competition.

More than anything else does the Guild idea break down the artificial distinction between national and municipal politics. The Guildsman is a conscious citizen, at one and the same time of his country and his city.

Unlike the modern trade union, the Guild would include not only manual but also brain workers in any industry and would make the carrying on of the particular industry, rather than the economic interests of its members, its first care. In the words of a Guildsman : "A system which gives a man reasonable control of the conditions of his working life, and also, as a citizen, of his political life," gives him the best chance "to express himself as a citizen and as a consumer as well as a producer."

The Guild sees the future citizen organised roughly into one of three groups of ownership —either the national, including all great industries and services ; or the municipal, such as gas, water, etc. ; or the co-operative, that is, what one may call the domestic industries, such as dairying, etc.

The story of the Guilds begins with the

Collegia or organised groups of workers founded in Rome, although labour unions have existed throughout history. Later, the communistic spirit of early Christianity gave rise to the mediæval Guilds, which were first religious; then came the struggles on the continent between the Guilds Merchant and the craftsmen, which ended in power in the municipality passing from the hands of the merchants into those of the craftsmen; and finally, with the dawn of capitalism, the Guilds began to disappear in the sixteenth century, only, later, to re-emerge as the modern trade union.

A careful study of the foregoing will show the student how vitally different is the Guild concept from any other, and how, if the idea spread through the trades unions, as it may easily do although in modified form, a new and powerful grinding stone will have entered the mill of citizenship.

In addition to the foregoing there have also been modern experiments seeking to produce a more perfect citizen without changing the structure of capitalist society, notably the Christian "Socialist" experiment under Charles Kingsley in the middle of the last century. The idea behind this was the

application of religion to economic problems, with special emphasis upon the importance of individual character, and which failed after some four years owing to an exaggerated idea of the inherent goodness of man and the attempt through the founding of certain co-operative societies to put a piece of "Christian commercialism" into the garment of an old Capitalism.

The modern experiment in citizenship which, with the possible exception of the Soviet experiment, dealt with in the next chapter, is probably the most far-reaching in its effects, is the co-operative experiment.

The three main factors in modern citizenship are Capitalism, Democracy, and Co-operation, and it is from the interplay of these forces that the twentieth-century citizen is evolving.

The idea behind co-operation is a voluntary union of persons for the joint production, distribution, purchase, or consumption of commodities for their mutual benefit. It does not seek to change political forms, being purely concerned with economics, but, spreading as it does the ideal of "individualist-co-operation," it must ultimately have

lasting effects upon the structure of society and the development of the individual citizen. In a word, it brings the microcosm of co-operation into the macrocosm of the individualist competitive system.

It started in practical form in 1844 at Rochdale, Lancashire, with a bag of flour which a few poor weavers bought after saving up their shillings and which they distributed amongst themselves at cost price. From that bag of flour has spread the enormous distributive and producing co-operative societies of Great Britain, France, Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands, the Scandinavian countries, Italy, Austria, Switzerland, Russia, Finland, the United States, Japan, India, South Africa, Iceland, etc.

It has perhaps found its most widely spread and perfect demonstration in Denmark, where the writer studied it for some years and where, amongst the most individualist people in Europe, except the Irish, a spirit of "individualist-co-operation" has sprung up as it is springing up in that other nation of individualists we have mentioned, proving that co-operation and individualism are not necessarily antagonistic and laying the seeds of that future individualist co-

operation towards which society, as we have before said, seems to be trending.

References

Plato's "Republic."

"American Communities," W. A. Hinds.

"History of American Socialisms," Noyes.

"Anarchism and Socialism," George Plechanoff. (Twentieth Century Press, Limited, London.)

"A Guildsman's Interpretation of History," Arthur J. Penty.

"Socialism in Church History," Rev. Conrad Noel. (1910, Palmer, 5s. net.)

"The Soul of Denmark," Shaw Desmond. (Fisher Unwin, Ltd., 1917.)

"A History of Co-operation in Rochdale" (1893).

"Labour Co-partnership in Great Britain and Ireland" (1898), Beatrice Potter.

"Paris," Émile Zola.

(N.B.—This book contains, in vitally interesting form, some of the most accurate studies extant of various concepts of citizenship.)

WE are now going to look at what is probably the most interesting and significant of the experiments in citizenship of our time—the Soviet Experiment, better known under its popular name of Bolshevism.

To understand this experiment and its later developments, in which it has evolved from the anarchist-communist “Soviet” or Workmen’s and Soldiers’ Council stage, to a rigid State Socialism, now an autocracy, one has to know something about the Russian people, who have been called a nation of drunken children, although drunkenness and genius have sometimes the same symptoms.

Before the Mongol invasion in 1224, Russia was covered by independent Republics of the type of the mediæval city-republics of Western Europe, and which, like them, were the nurture beds of a living citizenship.

At that time, the village community or *mir*, autonomous and independent, was the nucleus of Russian citizenship, and is, perhaps,

the most democratic of all forms of local government. Under it, the property both of family and village were owned on social rather than on competitive lines. Even to-day, in Bolshevik Russia, dominated by a dictatorship, this *mir* idea is probably the deep-rooted central idea of the mind of the Russian peasant at least. The Marxist Communism of Lenin and Trotzky is but the attempt of a minority of intellectuals to impose "State" socialism upon people who at heart have the anarchist decentralisation idea.

It was only when the Church, supported by the Mongol Khans, began to build up a military state around Moscow that the republican idea of citizenship was destroyed and all citizenship killed. The first Romanoff made his appearance only in 1613.

The whole story of the Romanoffs, as of the Lenins, has been the attempt to foist upon the Russian people systems of government unnatural to them.

In the middle of the nineteenth century, the battle of the "Westerners" versus "Slavophiles" began and persisted with great bitterness for some years. The former stood for the Western or "European" idea of citizenship, maintaining that Russia must necessarily

pass through the same stages as Western Europe—that is, through constitutional institutions, etc. The latter wanted the return of the “old Russia” principles of the Greek Orthodox Church, the absolute power of the Czar, and the patriarchal family.

Which brings up an interesting point. Citizenship, inspired as it must be by individualism, cannot take the same lines in any two countries. Other things being equal, the citizenship that develops out of the national genius and characteristics of a country will be the best for that country. Only, as the idea of inter-national citizenship spreads, will different systems possibly approximate, as countries learn from one another.

The Russian writers, philosophers, and publicists of to-day constitute perhaps a body of the world's most gifted men who have consciously considered the development of a new type of citizen and citizenship. Even beneath the surface of Leninism they are working, and their efforts must have profound effects upon the future of world-citizenship.

Two other prime factors in Russian social life should here be noticed—the *artels* and the *zemstvos*.

The artel or trade union is the very foundation of Russian industrial and co-operative organisation. Where it differs from the European trade union, and it takes many forms, is that it is a kind of mutual liability association, the artel being liable for the acts of all its members from theft upwards.

Russia has been divided for purposes of local government into zemstvos, the equivalent of the English county council, the Union of all these bodies being revived immediately after Germany made war in 1914, this being followed by a Russian Union of Towns, being the federation of all the Russian town councils. Ultimately, to the bodies of citizens developed by the Union of Zemstvos fell the most tremendous task ever laid on the shoulders of citizenship—that of victualling an army of 300,000 men, the whole of the army medical work, including sanitation, inoculation, etc., and the establishment of canteens, bath-houses, and laundries throughout Russia. Finally to its care fell the whole of the sick and wounded as well as a hundred other things.

Russian citizenship accomplished all this efficiently. It foreshadowed the time when the town council will replace Parliament and

possibly the unwieldy and huge centralised government departments of to-day.

The struggle in to-day's Russia largely resolves itself into that of centralisation and bureaucracy versus the ingrained republican federalist principle, municipal independence, and the independence of the village community.

The irresistible development of the Bolshevik idea can be traced with ease.

In the first place, the word, which means "majority," was originally used in the sense of a majority of the demands enunciated in the political programme of the Social-Democratic Labour Party, not "the demands of the majority." It has now been twisted from its original meaning to signify just "red revolution," whereas it actually signifies "State Socialism."

In the beginning, Lenin, a recluse and student, full of his Marxist ideas of the state and liberty and communism, like so many other reformers, found himself up against . . . "human nature." His original ideal was to establish "the State" with bodies of officials governing the various departments, elected by the people, but this being directly antagonistic to the Russian anarchist anti-

government nature, he was forced to do a little shooting. Then a little more. *Facilis est descensus Averni.* Before he knew where he was, he had embarked upon a Dictatorship, first called "the dictatorship of the proletariat," which really in to-day's Russia means the dictatorship of a minority of Marxist Communists over the Russian people (in Lenin's own party there are not more than 604,000 people).

It is true that the mass of the Russian people, including the Peasant Councils, which are nominally non-party and which represent about one hundred million persons, have tacitly accepted the Marxian theory. But that has been only because they were sick of the Czarist *régime*, and the peasants believed also that it meant getting possession of the land for which they lusted.

It is, in a word, the attempt to build up a Communist Republic upon the lines of a strongly-centralised State-Communism under the iron rule of the Dictatorship of a Party, and, ultimately, of one Napoleonic strong man. As in the case of Robert Owen, a philanthropic despotism has been found necessary for "democracy." Lenin himself has, as already stated, frankly said that liberty

is a bourgeois superstition and that he does not believe in it.

To-day, the Bolshevik citizen is rigidly controlled. From the age of 18, men and women have to work under the militarist control of the Soviet's nineteen great governmental departments. They can be transferred from place to place at will. And as may be expected under such a bureaucracy, it rains decrees.

Instead of the Marxian equality of reward for all classes of work, there is, as under capitalism, complete differentiation of reward according to class of work in the Bolshevik State, the wage-earner under the elaborate Bolshevik "Code of Labour" only getting pay for work actually done. If he doesn't work, or works badly, he can be put on to worse-paid work. Russia, in fact, has plumbed the root-fact of all economic citizenship: "Produce or perish!"

Bolshevism has been forced from theory to practice, which is the test of all citizenship. Finding that democratic shop control in the different industries by committees elected by the workers did not "work," it was at once scrapped, and one-man management instantly introduced. In other words, those

Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils, elected by the people locally both in 1905 and after the revolution, and which, with the Peasants' Councils that followed them a little later, are the groundwork of the modern Soviet idea, have been undermined by the hard facts of experience. The most remarkable thing of all is that the Soviet principle, starting out from the idea of complete liberty of the individual and which, in countries outside Russia, has been made the excuse for the throwing over of leaders and the breaking of contracts which followed the war, has ended in a despotism of bureaucracy to which history scarcely offers parallel.

Yet, in spite of all this bureaucracy, the Bolshevik leaders have been forced to bow their heads to or ignore the *mirs*, or village councils, which still persist throughout Russia. The battle, finally, will be between the local autonomy of the village council and the centralised State, and in its progress will hold valuable lessons for the students of citizenship everywhere.

As one writes, the All-Russia Congress of Soviets meets and elects its executive of 300, which in turn elects the People's Commissaries or Cabinet Ministers. These

ministers are absolute dictators, making laws without reference to the annual congress of Soviets. Behind them stand Lenin and Trotzky—ultimately Lenin, who, it is but fair to say, is genuine though fanatical.

But we must not run to extremes in our study. We must not imagine that this attempt to control the minutest acts of the citizen, as the Greeks tried it so many thousands of years before, “for his own good,” has not advantages as well as disadvantages, although they are advantages bought at the price of liberty.

Under it, it is possible for a few advanced men, or tyrants, as you will, to initiate new social experiments. It is, for example, true that in to-day's Russia, which, before the Revolution, was the worst educated of all European countries, all children between 8 and 16 are compelled to attend school and that remarkable strides have been made in education, in 1919 £140,000,000 being apportioned for this purpose. In 1918 alone, 7,000 new village schools were established, with 3,000 second-grade schools and a number of workers' universities, free. Theatres have been assigned to the workers, much upon the lines of certain Danish theatres which

are booked by the Danish Trade Unions for the performance of first-class opera and drama, and new art galleries have been opened. It is also only fair to say that religion is not in any way interfered with or penalised.

Many true things and many lies have been told about Bolshevism, but when all is said and done, any attempt, as we have before said, to artificially superimpose a system of superior people upon inferior, is bound to end in failure partial or complete. But out of such experiments, other and better systems may come, though probably upon quite other lines.

In citizenship, as in other things, men do their work, and pass on. Seeming automata, controlled by forces greater than their own, they do the preparatory spade-work that is essential to a developing perfection.

That is also true of the Soviet Experiment.

Reference

"Through Bolshevik Russia," Mrs. Philip Snowden.
(1920, Cassell, 5s. net.)

"The Russian Republic," Colonel Malone, M.P. (Allen & Unwin, London, 2s. 6d.)

It will here be of interest to make a comparison between one of the world's oldest citizens and one of its newest—between the Englishman and the American.

In the United States to-day there is developing a citizen of an entirely non-European type, a citizen fundamentally different to all who have preceded him. His development is taking novel lines, primarily through the extraordinary mixture of races in the North American continent, where unseen forces are working out the first Inter-nation experiment in citizenship.

This race mixture has led to a diversity of outlook in civic life that is at times bewildering, but it has also led to a receptiveness to new ideas and to a fearless virility, whether one appreciates it or not, that is of intense social interest.

This diversity of outlook has given rise to grave thought upon the part of the men who rule America, who are desirous of

getting a homogeneous "American" citizen, instead of what is known as "a hyphenated-American"—that is, an Irish-American, a German-American, etc. The former American Commissioner of Immigration gave it to the writer in New York last year as his opinion that some day the world would probably see America shut to all immigrants for a number of years in order to give America time to settle down and time for the "American" to develop. The demand for cheap labour alone had hitherto prevented it.

The American citizen is distinguished by three things. First, an intense individualism accompanied by an opposition to all trends towards centralised government; secondly, a certain primitiveness of youth, which carries with it the advantage of a readiness to accept new ideas; and, thirdly, a tendency to political and "community" experiment, which has no parallel in Europe.

What is especially characteristic of the cities of the United States as of Denmark, the first, one of the world's largest, and the latter, one of its smallest, countries, is the entrance of woman into almost every kind of public life, and, in the former country, the formation of women's clubs, co-operative

Home Clubs for mothers who remain in business after marriage, and women's unions. It is claimed that in no country has citizenship been so potently affected by women as in America, Wyoming leading the way in granting women's suffrage in 1869 and the 1920 Tennessee amendment enfranchising every woman of age in the United States, some 27,000,000 in all.

To the American, who so often refers to himself with pride as "an American citizen," democracy and individualism have been one and the same thing from the time when social reform was initiated in the States through the political agitation over the adoption of the Constitution. That American fear of centralisation, natural in a people newly escaped from the old and settled administrations of Europe, made it extremely difficult to obtain the assent of the various states to the Constitution, which was regarded as a concession to centralised government and the power of wealth.

Even so long ago as 1825, it was generally held by all American parties that "the best government was that which governed least," and it was during the first twenty-five years of the nineteenth century that the States began

to develop its now national individualism and the minimising of government action, federal, state, and local.

It is this which led the colonies of Plymouth and Rhode Island three centuries ago to put into force what is called the Initiative and Referendum, which together constitute what is known as Direct Legislation.

This direct legislation in small communities where all the voters can assemble together, bridges the centuries by banding together the New England town meeting, the present Swiss and ancient Teutonic *Landesgemeinden*, the Anglo-Saxon *folkmoot*, the Russian *mir*, and the old Greek and Roman *agora* or market-place meeting.

The idea of the modern Referendum in the United States, which takes many forms, is, roughly, to prevent the passing of tyrannous legislation by the centralised government until the voters have had time to pronounce upon it. Under it, a law does not come into effect until a certain time has elapsed, during which, if a minority, usually five per cent., sign a petition for its reference to the people, it has to be held up until the next election, when a majority vote accepts or rejects it. It may apply to all or only to some laws.

Under the Initiative, which, unlike the Referendum, is not preventive but positive, whenever a minority—usually 5 to 8 per cent.—files a petition asking for a certain law to be passed, the legislature has to vote on it, passing, amending, or rejecting. But if it does not pass it, a majority vote on this particular law can decide its rejection or enactment, independent of legislature or governor.

In the United States, the first organisation to promote Direct Legislation was formed in New Jersey in 1891, being known as the People's Power League. In city government it has made great strides, every city of the Pacific coast having it. Up to the world-war, state leagues had sprung up in twenty to thirty states.

The idea is to be found in other countries, including France, Canada, Australia, Norway, etc., the basic idea behind it being the protection of the individual from majority-tyranny, the idea which we have met so often in these pages, or, in other words, to secure democracy against itself.

What is so characteristic of American citizenship is just this passion for minority protection and a strong thought-current

which seeks to graft schemes of civic co-operation upon an individualist tree, which is the thing that makes it so interesting.

Here, in illustrating another curious difference between English and American citizenship, one cannot do better than quote from H. G. Wells's "Mankind in the Making." He writes : " The American atmosphere has one great and indisputable superiority over the British : it insists upon the right of every citizen, it almost presents it as a duty, to do all that he possibly can do ; it holds out to him even the highest position in the State as a possible reward for endeavour. Up to the point of its equality of opportunity, surely no sane Englishmen can do anything but envy the American State. In America ' presumption ' is not a sin. All the vigorous enterprise that differentiates the American from the Englishman flows quite naturally from that ; all the patriotic force and loyalty of the common American which glows beside the English equivalent as the sun beside the moon." But the man who has perhaps the widest and deepest sociological vision in the world, goes on to show the points of superiority in the English atmosphere over the American.

American citizenship is, in a word, another and vital contribution to social evolution.

The Englishman, on the other hand, secure in his position as the traditional representative and pioneer of parliamentary and democratic institutions, is much less prone to new experiments in citizenship and is, generally, more conservative than his brother of the United States. In the history of the Magna Charta in 1215, of John Ball, "the mad priest of Kent," who preached democratic co-operation in 1360, followed by the Peasants' Revolt; in More's "Utopia" of 1516; later in the contest between King Charles and Parliament; and then, in those later experiments to some of which we have already referred, as also in the municipal housing schemes; "Garden cities;" Labour colonies, etc.—it is in all these things that he feels England has laid the milestones in her advance towards a fuller citizenship and with it his franking as the world's pioneer citizen.

The Englishman does not make such violent mistakes as the American, but, on the other hand, he is perhaps less likely to take advantage of new ideas, which is only to say that age is less receptive and less malleable than youth in things civic as in all

else—something that is paralleled in all departments of life where America and England are concerned.

It is true that the average English householder of the English town usually finds his interest in municipal matters begin and end with the rates. It is true that his horizon is still limited as to the possibilities of citizenship. He is still too much the old-fashioned individualist to see the advantages of "individualist-co-operation." He is apt to save pennies and lose pounds by cutting down votes for baths and similar undertakings. And, like the citizens of other countries, he is led by labels such as "Moderate," "Progressive," etc.

But deep-rooted in the mind of the English democracy is the idea of civic dignity and responsibility. We see it in that respect which is paid to the mayor of an English town, in the eagerness to serve as councillors or aldermen without reward, and in the freedom from that civic corruption which in the American cities has called into being Municipal Leagues, etc. Even to-day Great Britain may be said to be one of the leaders of the world in its endeavour to solve social questions, even though it may not always be first in accomplishment.

Taking it all in all, the idea of civic democracy is the finest thing in English public life and a pledge for the evolution of a public consciousness upon civic matters.

The Englishman and the American stand for opposite sides of civic enterprise; each can learn from the other; and the lookers-on, i.e. fellow-students like ourselves, can learn from both.

With the above comparison goes naturally a short consideration of the citizen under a Republic or a Monarchy.

So far as one can see, except in idealistic theory, it matters little, substantially, whether citizenship develops under one or the other. Citizenship has its life apart from mere political forms, which gives it its unique force as a politico-social corrective.

Rome under the Republic developed a condition of tyranny under which the citizen was subordinated and all civic activities hampered. Later, under the emperors, it showed a despotism under which all social life groaned. The Republic of Greece evolved a State Socialist bureaucracy little distinguishable in tyranny from that of many of the monarchies of which we have record or from the Bolshevik *régime* itself.

And it is true that to-day citizenship is as free to develop itself in monarchical England as in republican America. There was, before the war at least, a greater freedom of speech and civic action permitted in England than in the States. What does not seem to matter much is the *form* of government.

It is literally true that governments change their structural forms as the minds of their citizens change. This holds good through the ages. Whenever men have advanced to the necessary stage of development, their shackles have fallen away of themselves. It is not bayonet but brain that accomplishes revolutions. Not bullets, but ballots.

TAKING a bird's-eye view of the preceding chapters, we notice certain salient facts standing out in our review of citizenship and the citizen, from the earliest times down to the present.

The first fact is what we have called the principle of "the ascending spiral," in which we have seen how, in his experiments in citizenship, man returns over and over again to the same idea or principle but usually on a higher level. The next, that in all ages we see the antagonistic yet complementary principles of centralisation and decentralisation fighting for mastery. Finally, it has been coming to us more and more clearly that the real problem facing the citizenship of the future is the problem of minority protection, or, of securing the rights of the individual in face of or as well as the rights of the community.

It cannot be too strongly emphasised that this last apparently insoluble and eternal problem is the root-problem of the future.

Already, we have seen that no single principle is absolutely right any more than any single individual is absolutely right. This world of ours is not made up of blacks and whites, but of many colours, blending.

To say that certain things concern the individual and certain things the community, although that is the generally accepted view, would seem to be artificial. Everything that concerns one concerns the other, directly or indirectly, and as we advance in this age of the breaking-down of barriers, local, national, mechanical, this holds true with ever greater force.

Within each one of us are links not only with the present in those immediately about us, but with the past through our ancestors, and in a wider, deeper sense, with the whole world, past and present. The truth of this last will at least have been apparent from our examination of the history of citizenship. Age is linked with age; individual citizen with individual citizen.

What we have to decide is how far citizenship and local government has concern with the individual citizen, first, in those personal acts which apparently affect him alone, and, secondly, in those which affect others. Shall

the municipal council forcibly prevent a man from drinking to excess, on the principle that the drinking individual makes the drunken community, or indeed, if alcohol be regarded as harmful, from drinking at all, as the dead-weight majority has just decided in the United States? And so, through the whole gamut of personal tastes and excess?

Also, in matters such as trade, the question arises as to how far the municipality or the state shall control or take an active part in production? How far shall the official replace the civilian?

Or, to put it the other way, if, as is generally admitted, the community has no right to interfere with a man's personal tastes in religion, why should it have the right to interfere with his personal tastes in drinking or drugging, or with his personal behaviour?

One is stating this with a broad simplicity because the sooner we realise that it is entirely and perhaps eternally impossible to reach finality of principle in such matters, the better. Man, the social animal, despite all logic, all intellect, all theory, is constantly being forced by experience back upon—or is it forward to?—that sense which in the

lower creation we call instinct, and in man, intuition. The community develops a sort of communal consciousness or feeling about these things, which is sometimes a better, at any rate a more inevitable guide, than rule-of-thumb logic, which bears the same relation to intuition that the landmark or the star of the old-time navigator bore to the compass.

Logically, if we are state socialists or collectivists, we can conceive, as outlined in the previous pages, the community being administered by bodies of officials, elected by the community, who will order each act of our daily lives "for the greatest good of the greatest number," as indeed the ancient commonwealths believed themselves entitled to do. Logically seen, that is democratically fair and the community has no right to grumble at even the most iron-bound legislation put through by its own elected representatives. "If it does not like them, can it not change them?" is the argument.

But in practice, even the most convinced democrat finds that ironbound officialdom, even under a democracy, leads to tyranny and to lack of initiative. He finds that systems, apart from the human beings who

create them, tend to develop a separate vitality and life so that change of councillors brings no change of system, the machine mastering the man. He finds, in fact, that the rights of the community over the individual, that is the rights of the majority over the minority, can never be absolute. He staggers upon the astounding, heretical—*Democracy has its limitations.*

If, on the other hand, we are convinced and logical individualists, the form of local administration which we ought to advocate would be one freed to the utmost from the official. We should place the post-office in the hands of the highest bidder. We should stop at once all municipal enterprise in gas, water, housing, etc., and substitute private enterprise, handing over such activities to the contractor submitting the lowest tender, which, incidentally, would let in the jerry-builder and his kind.

We should not forbid the formation of local trusts or national combines, because these are the legitimate and inevitable products of a system of absolutely free competition, and, as a matter of fact, all anti-Trust legislation, whether in the States or elsewhere, has hitherto failed under that

system to affect them. We should plead as far as possible for the utmost decentralisation of government, both civic and national.

Only, if we did all this, we should find ourselves ultimately driven into the only logical individualism—that of the anarchy with which we have dealt, and which forbids any interference whatever with the individual by the community “so long as he does not interfere with the rights of others,” which indeed, in its turn, destroys even the otherwise logically watertight argument of the anarchist himself.

In citizenship we are discovering that there is no such thing as absolute brute logic!

For anarchy and individualism, as socialism and despotism, meet when produced far enough. It is this principle of extremes meeting which, in the evolution of human affairs, is the eternal “steam governor” that, as in the marine engine, prevents the screws which drive the human machine from “racing” and so shattering the whole fabric. The whole social structure is made up by an exquisite and automatic balancing of strain against strain—of principle against principle.

The individual at any rate has always one

redress if he find the views of the majority intolerable—that is, to remove to another community, or, to take an extreme case, to live in one of the desert places of the earth, cut off from his kind. That is what the hermit has done in all ages.

What we are seeing to-day is the clash of two competing thought-streams, from the impact of which the future citizenship, as the future social structure, will evolve. One is the individualist stream—the other the democratic.

Individualism, like the Capitalism or the system of free competition of which it is the base, views the citizen in one way. Democracy, or the word which is now replacing it, Socialism, in another. The former regards the system as paramount; the latter, the individual—thus reversing the usually accepted view.

To the capitalist, generally and with increasing modifications, “the survival of the fittest” represents the law of life, from which man will depart at his peril and at the peril of society. Under the modern competitive system, which to him is sacred, the individual citizens are regarded as so many potential profit-makers, leading, in the

grinding out of profits, to the grinding out also of a superior type of citizen.

Anything that interferes with the free use of the individual citizen towards this end is, not unnaturally, impatiently rejected or brushed aside. Everything is apt to be regarded from the "profit" standpoint. If a new municipal enterprise be proposed, the question asked by the fervent individualist is not: "Will it benefit the community?" but "Will it interfere with private enterprise?" "Will it interfere with *the system*?"

That, after all, is only human nature.

Man, the citizen, the dreamer, is eternally logical. Whether individualist or socialist, he is for ever striving after the watertight argument which does not exist, because if it did, we men and women would become automata in a stagnant world and there would be no need for citizenship, i.e. for evolution's mainspring.

The capitalist, faced with the fact that collective enterprise does make progress, faced with the great national schemes of army or navy or police or post-office, faced by the progress of municipal enterprise, in his effort, usually an honest effort, to make his own system watertight, draws a distinction be-

tween certain kinds of activities and certain others. He distinguishes between Dreadnoughts and dustbins on the one hand, and dentistry and door-frames on the other ; between water and washing-boards ; gas and gridirons ; the carrying of letters and the carrying of almost anything else ; as between running the country during war and running it during peace. One, he says, comes within the domain of "private," the other of "public" enterprise.

The ultra-democrat, his opponent, on the other hand, places before all else the immediate advantage of the individual (although he declaims against "individualism"). "The system is all bad," he says. "Away with it ! "

He goes on : "Every man, as citizen, has the right to the fullest, freest use of all things. Every man has a claim on four meals a day, to a maximum of leisure and entertainment." In other words, he says : "The individual is supreme. Down with society ! "

Both individualist and democrat forget that while, on the one hand, the system of free competition is being smoothed down and qualified in a hundred ways and the individualist is learning that a necessary ingredient of citizenship is democracy, on the other,

democracy, in those countries where it has farthest advanced, is beginning to find out that the necessary ingredient of democracy is individualism. The democrat, and especially since the great war, is finding that necessity as a goad to effort is still essential for large masses of people and that, whilst the democratic experiment is limitless, its application at any given time is limited.

The democratic ideal of citizenship is, on the face of it, the fairest, fullest ideal—an ideal to be aimed at, but, still, an ideal only. When it is realised as an ideal it will show all sorts of unsuspected weaknesses, and the ideal, as past ideals, will in its turn give way to another ideal. The evolution of citizenship is never ending. There are no limits to citizenship, for there are no limits to life.

It is impossible for us here to set down the limitations of either individualism or socialism in our citizenship. For such limitations will be determined in each age according to country and race and development. The citizens themselves will determine them individually according to the standard they have reached. There will be eternal play and interplay of the two principles, each modifying the other.

No man, however wise, can lay down or foresee the system into which our society will evolve. If he be wise, he will not attempt it. Here is a case where "fools rush in." The chances are that future systems will take forms utterly different from our mental constructions of to-day. New times will bring new problems and new minds and methods to solve them.

But there is one principle which, so far as any can be dogmatic in human affairs, would seem to be fixed and inviolate. That is, the principle of Co-operation. The ideal of citizenship should be to secure a maximum of co-operation, always providing that the co-operation is not forced but voluntary.

Co-operation can take a thousand forms, from the ordinary co-operative store to the numberless co-operations of citizens through town council, public meeting, etc. Co-operation, when it is forced, can of course degenerate into slavery. But one can scarcely conceive any voluntary co-operation working other than good both for the community and the individual.

For the ideal of citizenship is the cultivation of society and of the individual at one and the same time. What helps one helps

the other. That is a truism which few realise. The community and the individual are, ultimately, one and the same thing.

References

- “On Liberty,” John Stuart Mill.
- “The Man v. the State” and “The Sins of Legislators,” Herbert Spencer.
- “On Compromise,” John Morley.
- “Classes and Masses,” W. H. Mallock.
- “Economics,” A. T. Hadley.
- “The Wealth of Nations,” Adam Smith.

FOLLOWING from the preceding, it will be well to consider the evolutionary concept of the privileges of the citizen advancing with responsibility, which concerns itself essentially with the outstanding phenomenon of our time—the advance of democracy to power.

If there be a fundamental weakness in modern democratic citizenship, it is the failure to see that the price of privilege is responsibility.

As a perhaps not unnatural reaction from autocracy, the world during the last fifty years has become a babel of brotherhood, out of which we hear the demands of democracy coming with ever-increasing insistence, demands for more "bread, beer and 'baccy," as it has been phrased, but sometimes at least without any realisation of the training and self-development necessary before freedom and plethora can be borne.

It is good that human beings should demand and work for the fullest freedom. It is their right. But it is also good that they should

realise that, as men immured in dungeons cannot bear the sunlight but need preparation for it, so freedom itself needs preparation.

Privileges can be tolerated and used to advantage exactly as far as responsibility advances with them. The citizen is just as much master of life as he is master of himself. No more and no less.

A man may be a convinced democrat, a passionated socialist, and yet subscribe to this. If he be a thinking democrat, he will have to subscribe to it.

The Democratic Experiment in Citizenship is still but an experiment, and like all other experiments needs time and training for its full development and the gradual creation of machinery strong enough to bear the new strains.

Here one is not concerned with either the "Haves" or the "Have nots." One is only concerned with that humanity which they together compose.

As has before been pointed out in these pages, an infinitely higher state of *morale* and training is necessary for the Democratic State than for the Autocratic. In one case the individual has to do the thinking. In the other he is *thought for*.

It is of success that the rising democracy has to beware, unless it has carefully prepared itself. Few people can bear success, whereas many can bear failure and learn from it.

To every demand by any section of the people to take over and administer any department of human life, the question will have to be asked : "Will you be responsible?" And that other : "What do you propose to do?" Whether it be a tram or a dustcart or a central power supply—the administration of a village or a province or an empire, the question will always have to be asked of the aspirants : "Are you responsible?" Or rather, it is the aspirants themselves who will have to ask themselves the question : "Dare we be responsible?" "What are we going to do?"

What Democracy so often forgets in its demands for the fuller citizenship with its accompanying powers, is that however badly autocracy often governs, whatever its shortcomings, its adherents have had experience in governing, have some sense of that responsibility which comes from authority and administration. It is true that the plutocracy of wealth is in our day rapidly breaking down that sense of responsibility

which was so often seen in the older aristocracy, but it must not be forgotten that this is the inevitable preparatory stage for the coming of Democracy, which will fight it out with the Plutocracy, for the plutocratic and democratic concepts of citizenship are polaric.

But if the Democracy be not developed sufficiently, and, above all, have not the sense of responsibility, it is quite possible that the Democratic Experiment in Citizenship, which rightly seeks to give to the individual citizen the fullest possible privileges and freedom consistent with the good of the community, will break down and human evolution once more be thrown back as it has been thrown back many times before in history. And after all unsuccessful experiments in democracy, the demand is invariably for more, not less, autocracy.

The trend to-day is towards a demand for a citizenship based more or less upon economic equality, that is the same reward for all work irrespective of type. But the people who make that demand forget that in their present stage of development, the great majority need inequality of reward as stimulus both as to quantity and quality of work. To introduce anything approaching economic

equality with any prospect of success would need a new generation of man and women, educated to the instinct of honour, of a self-restraint and idealism as far above to-day's average civilised humanity as the average European or American is above the undisciplined, un-moral dweller of the slums.

That immeasurable advance in such qualities could be made in the course of four or five generations educated into a conscious citizenship, is fairly assured, but we are not likely to see the experiment upon a sufficiently exhaustive scale until the study of citizenship and the systematic education of the child as citizen has taken its place in the human consciousness as what it is—the fundamental study and needful preparation for all permanent social advance.

THE man as citizen and the woman as citizen are in a way entirely separate problems. Men and women are so fundamentally and necessarily different. Between them, they constitute the two elements of citizenship—the creative and the preservative elements.

As the human being advances in complexity, physical, mental, spiritual, this differentiation is likely to become more, not less, acute, for with increasing complexity comes increasing specialisation of function. In citizenship, as in so many other things, women cannot be too splendidly feminine and men too splendidly masculine.

The man to-day is, in civic matters, “the man in possession.” He will continue to function, as hitherto, only his functioning will be broadened and modified by the coming of the woman councillor.

That is the reason why the best way to consider the man as citizen will be to do so

negatively by primarily considering his help-meet and her special functions.

As the modern battle for the recognition of woman as citizen has now been fought and won practically throughout the world, it is not necessary here to prove her claim to equal citizenship rights with man. The giving of the vote to woman in England and other countries has marked an epoch and with it the beginning of the full democratic experiment. Never before in the history of the world has there been full adult suffrage, nor indeed had such a thing ever been contemplated.

Even the enlightened Rousseau wrote in "*Emile*" : "Women are specially made to please men . . . all their education should be relative to men ;" and in 1797 Charles Fox said in a speech that even "the most absurd speculation had never thought of extending the suffrage to the female sex."

In Great Britain it was not even thought worth while to definitely exclude women from citizenship until the Reform Bill of 1832.

Historically, woman, the citizen, shows herself early. Society first formed itself around her as the mother, despite the fact that she has been regarded both as slave and

toy. Yet even in the most barbarous tribes we have records of her being at times more honoured as citizen than in more civilised periods. In the heroic period of Greece, she occupied a high place in the community, and because she was primarily regarded civically as the medium of producing citizens, as in the year 1920 she is being regarded in after-the-war Germany, she was more or less fettered to her household.

In Rome, except in the earliest period, her legal rights were greater than in Greece, but it may be said that it was Christianity, despite its occasional relegation of her to an inferior position, which first ultimately made her fuller citizenship possible.

In the Middle Ages, we find the Germanic Tribes honouring women on the basis of equality with man, although the coming of the age of chivalry again partly relegated her to the "toy" position. The Reformation, whilst admitting certain evils into sexual relationships, probably, through secularisation and liberalisation, was the cause of the tendency which led to the modern movements for women's rights and finally indirectly made possible the first of the women's trade unions in England—that of the Cotton-spinners in

1827, which was the beginning of the flood-tide of women's trade union organisation.

Let us at the outset clear away some misconceptions as to the part to be played by woman in municipal and local government.

It is assumed—assumption is the bane of modern life—that woman for the first time in history has entered public life in our own times and taken active part in social organisation as trade unionist, etc. It is not true.

Not only were women members of the early Greek labour unions being called *hetæræ*, the term only later being applied to the courtesan, but inscriptions have been discovered in Italy and elsewhere showing that even in ancient times woman had her part in public affairs. One of these inscriptions found in Pompeii reads: "Verna, the home-born, with her pupils in all right, put forward Mrs. Capella for a seat on the Board of Magistrates." In the Roman *collegia*, of which we have already spoken, their chief officers were often women.

Another misconception is that the entrance of women into public life involves the idea of "competing" with man. But competition is not involved. The coming of woman simply means that the hitherto purely mas-

culine viewpoint in public affairs will be modified and supplemented by the feminine.

It is not that certain things in municipal affairs will be administered by women and certain others by men. It is only that men will in some take the initiative and leading part and women in the others.

It may be said that women in public life occasionally show male rather than female qualities. Where this is the case, the woman will of course use her peculiar gifts, but such transfusions are rare.

Women have been complaining that they have not been admitted to public life and permitted to do men's work—their real complaint should have been that their influence and opinions as women have been regarded as of less importance than those of men.

A very common misconception, even on the part of advanced women, is that when they enter public life their business is to imitate the man. That is just exactly what their business is *not*. It is for them to develop the latent gifts they possess, *as women*, and bring to bear the feminine influence, jointly with that of the male councillor, upon the common problems of the community of which they form more than one half.

A final misconception is that men and women councillors must themselves be technical experts in lighting, sanitation, etc., whereas the special function of the councillor of either sex is to appoint the best technical advisers and to get from them their best work. Theirs must be general, not applied, knowledge.

To find the natural channels for women's civic activities we must first consider the gifts with which nature has endowed her.

Prominent amongst these is her intuition. In the evolution of humanity, man has gradually become the objective or creative being, woman, the subjective or intuitive. We could have imagined an evolution in which men and women, whilst retaining their distinctive sex-traits and outlook, would have developed a better-balanced society. But we are dealing with facts, not fancies.

As it is, man is hypertrophied or over-developed upon the intellectual side and woman on the intuitive. Man is atrophied or under-developed upon the instinctive side and woman on the intellectual. Each quality has been developed at the expense of the other.

The intuitions of woman will be her civic compass and will be an inspired guide for man, the navigator of the ship of state.

But here it should be pointed out that the intellectual and intuitive, as the spiritual faculties of the man and the woman, are and will probably always be vitally different in *type*, even if the day should come when they will not be different in *quality*. Man and woman are unendingly different.

It is the hypertrophies and atrophies of humanity mentioned above which leave us our social problems, setting up those strains in the social fabric, the readjustment of which is the business of citizenship.

Woman, having her main concern through the ages with home and child, has developed an intensely practical and “managing” side, which should be of much value in her specialised work in local government. She has a way of getting to grips with facts and letting theory slide which in much of her public work has been illuminating.

With this has gone an exceptional capacity for attention to minutiae and a certain faithfulness and conscientiousness in carrying out her duties, which, prior to her entry into public life, had been observed in her work as business woman.

It is these two factors which have astonished the world by revealing woman as the supreme

organiser. Organisation, for some occult reason, had always been regarded as woman's weak point, but modern women's public activities in England and the British colonies, as in America, Germany, Austria, France, and other countries, have shown woman as organiser in a favourable light. Whatever we may think of its methods or views, the Women's Social and Political Union, in its fight for the vote in England, showed almost unexampled power of accurate and inspired organisation, and a fine administrative ability as heads of schools, institutions, trades unions, and co-operative undertakings is being shown by women in all countries.

Then behind all this we have woman's spiritual instincts as a valuable and needed contribution in civic matters. Wherever questions of morals are concerned, or where right waits upon expediency, the vote of the woman goes on the side of principle.

Woman in civic matters, as outside, is still the preserver. For practical gifts, organising gifts, and spiritual gifts form the trinity of preservation.

The sphere in civic matters for woman as citizen would therefore seem to be, generally, the practical and the intuitive, hitherto

regarded as antipathetic—that is, at one and the same time, the broad and the minute.

Man, on the other hand, is the restless creative animal, although, as municipal councillor, he seems to do his best to hide it. As initiator, it will be his chief business in the council chamber and the public meeting to set new schemes on foot, to work out financial possibilities and limits, and to take the lead in dealing with those activities which concern the community in a general sense, such as lighting, gas, water, paving, roadmaking, parks, sewage, sanitation, etc.

He will also largely concern himself with the machinery of civic administration such as rate-collection, including the "striking of rates." But above all, it will be his business to initiate. It is initiation that woman lacks, as she lacks practice.

The business of man as citizen will be to lay down broad, general principles—the business of the woman, the local and minute application of those principles, something for which her long training in the detailed organisation of the household will have peculiarly fitted her.

What should here be noted is that the "practical" side of the woman is quite

other than that of the man. Her concern is more with the *minutiæ* of life. Man's with the broader principles governing such *minutiæ*.

But all this is set down with considerable diffidence and not dogmatically. For woman in her development as citizen will unveil qualities and find new channels now undreamt.

No hard-and-fast line can of course be drawn in these matters. Men and women councillors will sometimes exchange their special functions, *and without exception will the feminine and masculine standpoint be brought to bear on all questions*. But as bisexual administration progresses, the spheres of the sexes will gradually define.

To come from the general to the particular, let us now glance briefly at the things that would seem most nearly to concern the woman as citizen.

Amongst those activities which will primarily concern the woman councillor and voter will be questions of children and motherhood. As H. G. Wells says : “A conscious, deliberate motherhood and mothering is her special function in the State.”

It will be her business upon the local health committee to see that maternity

centres and baby clinics, perhaps on the lines of those begun in England by Miss Margaret MacMillan, are started. If she be in England, she will be able to utilise the sanction of the Local Government Board for providing a staff of "mother's helps" and sick-room helps for women who are sick or about to be confined.

She would see that classes for domestic economy are opened and so save society in health and pocket; and, not being so objective as the male councillor, she will recognise that a high municipal rate may mean a low death-rate. In England alone, she will have as her potential pupils millions of women engaged in a day-to-day struggle to make both ends meet in their homes, women who are ignorant of the elements of housekeeping and with no idea of their relationship as consumers to the national supply. She will teach the girls baby-craft, house-craft, and needle-craft, and, generally, aim at the ideal which may one day be realised, of a comprehensive technical training for girls of all classes.

Where unemployment is threatened amongst women, it will be her special care to see that the municipality takes preventive and remedial measures.

But to render all this economically effective, it will be necessary for our women administrators to make a thorough study of social economy and to deliberately set themselves to take a regular and active share in the administration of business enterprises. The schools of theory and experience are both necessary.

Then an unexplored field awaits the woman citizen in pressing the local police authority to appoint police matrons at all police stations to deal with cases of women and girls; and to appoint women police constables, as has been done by many of the American and Canadian cities as well as London, together with the cities of Germany, Scandinavia, and Switzerland.

Probably, in the near future, a further field for her activities will be the proposed Children's Courts in England and elsewhere, the object of which is to get juvenile offenders away from the police court atmosphere. With the coming of women magistrates in England, since the passing of the Sex Disqualification (Removal) Act, 1919, we see another and specialised branch for women in civic matters.

On the question of the endowment of

motherhood—that is, the protection of the potential or actual mother, which is of the first import to the community, the woman citizen can do fine and much-needed work.

There are two other things, for example, upon which women, if in sufficient numbers upon public bodies, might have rendered special service during the war in various countries—“profiteering” and waste. Women would undoubtedly have found a practical way out from profiteering and their instincts for economy would have helped to staunch the waste which always accompanies war.

The most modern and in many ways the most significant example of what women can accomplish is the wonderful “Community Councils” which have developed from an original meeting of four mothers in the Bronx district, New York City, as a protest against the dirty conditions of the schools, and which had as their first result the cleansing of all the schools in that quarter, leading finally to the Community Council experiment.

Sixty of these Councils are already active and there will soon be 200 in the five boroughs of New York. They all start with the open forum, around which their organisation is

built. They have initiated child-feeding classes, have provided libraries, cleansed filthy streets, launched regular physical examinations of the children and the education of all immigrant mothers. The councils are spreading fast and may some day be of greater import in American life than the Senate or the House of Representatives. They cover, literally, every department of public life from anti-mosquito campaigns to volunteer fire companies. And they have now spread to the negroes.

They are polyglot and consist of both men and women.

And all this sprang from the efforts of four ordinary women to whom citizenship meant something more than a word.

One can only refer in passing to what the American woman citizen has accomplished for herself and her country in organisations like the Women's Clubs of the United States, the membership of which is estimated at 1,000,000.

As another recent example of the trend of woman's citizenship, it is interesting to illustrate the constructive contribution of the American National League of Women Voters to the 1920 Presidential Campaign, in which

they have urged the platform-builders to insert planks on child welfare, education, home and high prices, better conditions for women workers, public health and morals, and "independent citizenship for married women." But women are playing a steadily increasing part in politics throughout the world.

One of the spheres in which the woman councillor's outlook will play an equal part with that of her male colleague is the sphere of public morals, upon which, as we have seen, the American women are concentrating. The feminine outlook is vital in the control of amusements, picture-palaces, theatres, etc. The only danger is that the woman's natural care for morals might sometimes lead to narrowness, but, so far as one can judge, woman's public influence hitherto in such matters in all countries has only been for good.

Another case for co-partnership control is that of education. Here is a case, obviously, in which men and women together will have to solve the difficulties presented by what is perhaps the most vital and most neglected problem of to-day.

It has been urged that as the need for the

feminine standpoint is so urgent upon all public bodies, men and women should be represented in equal numbers, and that this principle has been partially recognised in such bodies as the English Urban District Food Control Committees, upon which one member must always be a woman. But one does not subscribe to that. We are still holding to our voluntary view of citizenship. As the voter becomes educated to the need for women on the public bodies, so will he or she elect them and in the proportion he or she thinks fit.

The citizen, whether man or woman, falls into one of two categories—the administrator or official and the voter.

Practically all that has been said in the preceding pages applies equally to the woman as voter. There is not a woman in any country who has the vote who is not closely interested in the active sides of citizenship, and where she has no vote, her business as citizen is to agitate for it.

She owes this interest not only to herself as woman but to her children born or unborn. It will be for her as voter to bring pressure to bear upon the woman councillor as upon the man councillor, in connection with the special

points mentioned. She will regard her vote where she has it as a sacred trust, not to be bartered or lightly given. The vote is her sign manual as the equal of man—even her sign manual as human being.

It is woman's business as citizen to concentrate on the home *outside* the home. When it is stated that her public activities will interfere with her home life, one can only point to the experience of the Community Councils, etc., as in countries like Denmark, where she often keeps up her work, both public and professional, after marriage. The concern with the home does not start inside, but outside, and women will one day regard a portion of their time and effort as due to their public work. Better local councils mean better houses, and the house of the trained citizeness is likely to be better than that of the untrained.

What the woman citizen wants to be is not less "feminine," but to have a more conscious femininity. "Consciousness" is the be-all and end-all of evolution. It is so in the evolution of the citizen. The consciousness of women when aroused may one day change the destiny of the world. It will yet bring "love" into politics.

It must never be forgotten that men and women are neither superiors nor equals. The superiority of either over the other in certain qualities has been purchased at the cost of inferiority in others. Neither is superior to the other. Neither is the same. Each has his or her special province. The whole idea of citizenship is that both sexes shall function upon the same tasks and objects, but each sex with its special viewpoint and method.

But the supreme advantage of men and women acting together on public bodies is the mutual development and modification resulting.

Out of it will spring the newer comradeship.

References

- “The Subjection of Women,” John Stuart Mill.
- “Women as Trade Unionists,” Gertrude Tuckwell.
- “History of Trade-Unionism,” Sidney Webb. (Longmans & Co.)
- “Women and Economics,” Mrs. Perkins Gilman.
- “The New Republicanism” and “A Modern Utopia,” H. G. Wells.
- “History of European Morals,” Lecky.

EVERY man or woman interested in citizenship, whether from the standpoint of administrator or elector, should have some knowledge of the training of the councillor or public worker. Here some of the leading points are briefly shown.

Public work has a peculiar fascination of its own and no man or woman to-day can say that chance or design may not at some period or other place them in an administrative position. Our public servants to-day are largely recruited from men and women who originally never had any idea of taking up such work.

We will take English public work as our example, although what is said here will apply practically to civic activities anywhere.

The alpha and omega of councillorship lies not in the mechanical, as is so often supposed, but in the human element, although it should be a human element allied with a thorough knowledge of duties. If the councillor regard

local politics as a game for personal advancement, he will not be able to get into touch with the officials and with his fellow councillors. But if he can convince the officials that his motives are pure, they will help him in every way to learn his business, whether it be in the committee room and the council chamber on the one hand, or on the other in the generating station, the disinfection station, or the child clinic.

The man or woman who is "human" can get things done.

The next point for the councillor is absolute regularity of attendance at committee and council meetings and the determination never to leave a meeting or be "tired out" until his particular point has been properly dealt with or carried. (The life of many an innocent man accused of murder has been saved by a similar "public sense" on the part of one obdurate juryman, holding out against eleven others.) Nor will the conscientious councillor confine his public work to the ordinary routine meetings or official "rounds of inspection." He will, living in the neighbourhood as he does, and without being fussy, constantly keep his eyes open for abuses in his municipality, whether of the streets, housing, etc. He will

be constantly looking for improvements in all the work of the council, and he will understand that the prime object of the councillor is not to keep down the rates. Sometimes spending means economy, especially where public health is concerned.

And the councillor who is not strictly utilitarian will know that an eye for beauty is a part of councillorship. He will always seek to make his district as beautiful as possible, by removing unsightly buildings and slums, and by seeing that new buildings are made not only useful but ornamental, and by introducing parks and playgrounds wherever possible.

For the councillor of the future is going to be an artist as well as a business man or woman.

He will see that his council is a good employer, for the municipality must be the model or should be the model which all other employers of labour should feel themselves compelled to follow. And he will familiarise himself with the rates of pay of its employees from the roadscraper to the nurse, librarian, or Medical Officer, and see that, as is so often the case, the men in the better positions are not the worst paid.

Whilst, at the outset, the councillor of either sex should work up an all-round knowledge of local conditions, it will be found more advantageous after a time to specialise in one subject, whether it be housing or child welfare, food control or baths, open spaces or municipal trading, unemployment or finance.

The best and the most difficult work of the councillor is done in Committee. Many public servants believe that by making showy speeches which are reported in the local press they are doing everything that is necessary. Such men and women, although it is rare to find women doing this, will find themselves quickly disillusioned. Effective public service needs study and application.

At the outset, the councillor will be faced with certain problems which he will have to decide in his own mind at the outset of his career.

Amongst these will be the question of supplying electricity, etc., through private companies rather than through the council. Another, that question to which we have so often referred, the question of local government centralisation or decentralisation. There are also several other questions of

broad principle upon which the public servant will have to take stand on one side or the other.

One point must not be overlooked. Local public work is the best avenue to all public life as well as a splendid test of character. It is the best training-ground for parliament, if national activities are sought, and however much parliament has in various countries fallen from its high estate and become to an extent the battleground of parties and personalities rather than one of principles, it is essential that, so long as they continue to function, we should have the best women and men available for the national assemblies of the world.

BECAUSE we have not evolved a common personal pronoun for both sexes, one is forced here to designate the citizen or citizenship by the masculine "he," unless otherwise stated. For what is said here applies to either sex in varying degree.

We are now going to consider the duty of the citizen in what would seem to be its natural order: (1) to himself; (2) to his family; (3) to his companions; (4) to his country; and (5) to the world.

A man's first duty is to the community through *himself*. Enlightened egoism is the secret of communal service. The self-regarded inferior or self-neglected individual means the inferior or neglected community. Self-realisation is every whit as important as self-sacrifice for the citizen, man or woman. Much sentimental and ill-considered, because one-sided, nonsense has been written about the sacrifice of self. The man who talks most

about self-sacrifice is so often the man who has least to sacrifice.

The full realisation of the citizen does not lie either way, but both ways.

The world has seen the pagan idea of society, in which the indulgence and realisation of self has been the leading motive. Then, with the swing of the pendulum, and necessarily, came the reverse principle with the advent of Christianity—the sacrifice of self. Now the pendulum is not swinging back to the pagan concept, but outwards in an entirely new direction towards a point in which both principles are blended.

A citizen's first duty is to his physical body, simply because it is the channel through which the mind functions. A sickly body often means a sickly soul. The exception is where it is nature and not the citizen himself that is to blame. But even the sickliest body, where there is no organic disease, can be improved out of all knowledge. The body, like love, is "highly dirigible."

Upon physical fitness often literally depends the quality as well as the quantity of service of which the citizen is capable. One of those hypertrophies and atrophies of life, of which we have spoken, is the modern artificial

divorcement of body and mind, so that the modern thinker is rarely the man of physical power, or the man of physical power the thinker. The Greeks, with that immortal recognition of the interdependence of mind and body, that *mens sana in corpore sano* which people are always quoting without understanding, insisted upon both physical and intellectual power in the normal citizen.

Therefore our citizen will be moderate in his eating and drinking. He will exercise his body each morning through systematic light gymnastics, as will his wife, following the beautiful Athenian women who each morning went through their exercises in public. He will, if his tastes lie that way, indulge in sports that are not too strenuous. He will wash his body and keep it suitably clothed and adorned. For self-respect is the beginning of citizenship.

The day when genius is not noticeable by excessive slovenliness and untended body will be the day of the fuller citizenship.

It would take a book in itself to cover the duty of the citizen to himself in the area of the mind. We will glance at a few outstanding points.

Speaking, as we are, of the adult citizen,

he will have obtained a certain modicum of education, which, unfortunately, even in the best cases under our educational system, often practically resolves itself into a knowledge of reading, writing and arithmetic. The "extras" are but too often so many frills and furbelows without meaning. But one of the first duties of the conscientious citizen will be, as far as possible, either at home or attending specialist classes, to remedy the defects of early education, and, above all, he will remember that the finest school of all, the school of life, is always open to him.

Many great men and women have said : "I only began to learn when I left school."

As living unit of a living world, with his desire to live his life fully, he will keep in touch with the thought of that world. The channel is at his elbow—the modern newspaper, which can be one of the most soul-destroying as it can be one of the most life-building media. To get the best from the newspaper is an art in itself.

He will read his favourite newspaper with criticism and aloofness, neither subscribing to nor dissenting, thoughtlessly. He will see what the great world outside, of which in the larger sense he is a citizen, is thinking politi-

cally, intellectually and spiritually. He will read his divorce or his murder case, if he do read them, not with eyes greedy for sensation, but as interpreters of life. He will follow his local and his national politics intelligently, not being hazed by phrases or personalities. And he will avoid the "snippet" par. as if it were poison, as indeed it is, for its purpose is to prevent thinking.

All this may seem so much counsel of perfection, but, unless one's newspaper reading be systematised, one's mind can become a sort of lumber room and one can waste over the daily papers enough time to grasp the salient points of history or to master a couple of languages—and the mastery of at least one other great modern language should be the business of every citizen who wishes to break into those new worlds of literature and thinking which lie behind the barriers of a modern tongue. As a matter of cold fact, it is but seldom that by intelligent reading one cannot master the essential contents of a paper within twenty minutes or less.

The citizen will also find in the theatre and the picture palace instruction and interest, and the day is fast coming when the instruction that is not interesting will be relegated to the

The Duties of the Citizen

grave of dead ideas. He will find it in the street, the club, the office. He will, unconsciously, after a time, hold himself open and responsive to all outward stimuli.

He will find, in other words, his education in life and living, and all this will be part of his mind-training.

Without hesitation, one will place mind-training in one of its forms as the very foundation of civic development. Mind-training is only another word for learning to concentrate. No citizen can give of his best to the world or to himself until he has learned that method of concentration and specialisation upon an all-round foundation which seems to be the secret of success in the real sense of that much-abused word.

A lifetime of even seventy years is all too short to accomplish more than one thing well. Where men and women do several things well, it is safe to say they would have done any one of these things better by concentrating upon it alone.

Excessive specialisation, however, is just as bad as excessive generalisation. Specialisation must have all-round knowledge for its base. But for all this, concentration is necessary. The lack of it is the weakness of

the modern mind, which has been disintegrated by the vast number of new ideas which the annihilation of distance by electricity has made available in our nervous, complex times. Our grandmothers and grandfathers could concentrate better because they had less to handle. It is easier to drive simple cart-horses than complex thoroughbreds.

The root of this concentration is the systematisation of the individual life of the citizen. The systematising of his work and play, of his study, of all activities. Not a mechanical systematising, but a general and free following of that cyclic principle that runs through all evolution. We can either work against the evolutionary stream or with it. In either case we evolve, but in the latter case much more quickly.

An important part in mental training is the systematising of reading. Reading without system is a menace to development. The brain becomes a sort of intellectual dustbin into which one throws all sorts of things higgledy-piggledy.

A man here, after he has laid in a general and systematic groundwork of all-round knowledge, should follow lines of reading that for him have special interest. All men, with a few

fortunate exceptions, outside the business by which they are forced to gain their bread, have some special love. Some day we shall so organise society that men will be able to give their main efforts to the thing they love and so avoid the present terrible waste of time and effort by placing square pegs in round holes. But that day is not yet. Citizenship alone can make it possible.

If a man care for architecture, he will read a series of architectural books dealing with the various styles and countries. If it be politics, he will decide whether his bent be home politics or international politics or labour politics. In each case his reading will follow the particular line. If it be citizenship, and more and more people to-day are turning to this, he will read some of the various books given as references here, as well as others.

The systematising of reading adds peculiarly to its pleasure and profit, although the first effort is apt to be tiresome.

One other thing vital to the training of the mind may here be referred to—the necessity of reading history, which of all reading is possibly the most important and which should form part of the groundwork of all other reading.

A proper reading of history does not consist in the learning of the names and dates of kings and battles, but in the understanding of the broad forces, economic and personal, which have moulded human life on the planet. The supreme advantage of understanding history is the time and thought which are saved by following the process of how life has been articulated link by link and by seeing how men have in different ages over and over again come back to the same thought upon a different plane—how they have experimented and rejected, and so on.

A proper understanding of history is the key to all social knowledge, as it is a key to the puzzle of life.

The final determinative point of special interest is the part played by the individual conscience in the domain of citizenship. The citizen is bound not only for his own sake but for the sake of his fellows to follow his conscience rather than the community, where these things clash. No community has the right to ask from a man that in matters essential he shall go against his conscience. Only each man has to decide for himself what are “essentials.” Every

man will have a different boundary line and a different concept from his fellows and will himself change as he progresses or retrogrades. For progression involves also the possibility of retrogression.

When all is said and done, the final court of appeal is the individual conscience.

To his *family*, the duty of the citizen may be roughly indicated in a few sentences.

The men and women of to-day are for the first time beginning consciously to realise that all life is preparation for parentage.

Here, as so often, the economic question comes first. The duty of the citizen to his family really commences before it appears. It is the business of the good citizen not to marry until he is tolerably sure that he can provide for a family. It is the business of the citizeness not to marry until she is assured of the same, although in these days when women are invading all spheres, the question that has to be considered is often not the individual but the joint earnings.

The good citizen, having married, will not bring more children into the world than he can provide for, and he will remember that a small family well brought up is better than a large family neglected. The whole tendency

of modern civilisation and thought is towards a smaller family, something that need not imply either decadence or degeneration. Quality is more important than quantity.

Having secured himself upon the economic side and brought his children into the world, the good citizen will remember that the primary business of citizenship is to promote *growth*—physical, mental, spiritual. The thing that does not grow does not stand still—it retrogresses. It is the law of life.

That is why the three things that immediately intrude themselves upon his attention are feeding, clothing, and education—“education” being used not in its narrow sense of providing a school but of that fuller education in living which the father and mother alone can give in the beginning.

Frankly the citizen’s duty to his children is less to mould them than to let them alone—which is not to neglect them. In the home as the State, “the best government is that which governs least.” That individualism which is the red cord running through our concept of citizenship, still holds good here. The essential duty of the parent is to get the most out of his children, and to do this means giving full play to their individualities.

It is his business perhaps to lay down general guiding lines for immaturity, but to give the fullest, freest scope to the individual child within these lines to develop and even at times to allow the child of marked individuality, if necessary, to "jump the lines." The parent does not know everything. If he did, there would be no progress!

The intelligent citizen will soon learn that in teaching he learns himself. The child is a great teacher of himself and of those who are wise enough to learn from him, as the Signorina Montessori has proved to the hilt in her now famous educational system. Full discussion of all things should be encouraged. Silence and acquiescence may be obtained at the price of other qualities, more essential. Discipline must be elastic or it becomes tyranny.

The citizen and his wife will watch for that most precious of all things—the individual development or characteristic. They will be guided in their final duty to their family, that is, the placing of their children in their future professions, by such evidences, for the child placed at the thing he loves is swimming with the stream of life—at the thing which he hates or dislikes or to which he is indifferent—against the stream.

Gradually, under modern conditions, conditions however which are being modified from day to day, and which have been profoundly modified by the great war, it will still be the main concern of the man as citizen, so far as the family is concerned, to earn the wherewithal to live and of the woman to concentrate upon home and the children. But it is not difficult now to foresee the time when the woman will bear her share in the earning of the daily bread and when the man will take a more active interest in domestic details than he does to-day. But the vista opened up is too vast to be dealt with here.

About training the child as citizen we will speak later.

Finally, the good citizen, following that enlightened egoism of which we have spoken, will not allow himself to be sacrificed to "the dear family." He will keep his individuality inside the family circle as he expects each unit to keep his or hers. So will he obtain diversity in unity.

To his *companions* and friends, the citizen can only be guided by the world's First Citizen, who laid down the golden rule: "Do unto others as you would they should do unto you."

Here again his duty lies first to himself, and to this all other things shall be added. It is not his duty to be what is euphemistically known as "a good fellow," which so often means "a weak fellow." It is not his business always to say the pleasant thing. It is his business sometimes to say the unpleasant thing . . . with discretion.

It is his duty without preaching to discuss public and political matters with his companions. He will not confine himself to the aimless chatter which so often passes muster for conversation, and he will, one assumes, choose his friends and circles with at least the care which the average man gives to the selection of a new suit.

All these things may seem almost painfully obvious, but they have to be said, for they are so often forgotten.

One would venture to say that a man's duty to his fellows, as indeed to the community, ends where the personal emotion or feelings come strongly into play, for the dividing line, intangible as it often may be, is marked by the point where the collective individuality, whether of one's companions or the community, begins to obliterate that of the person.

The citizen's duty to his country or the

State has been regarded by most writers as a primary duty which should take precedence of his duty either to himself on the one hand or to the world on the other. But with the fuller imaginings of citizenship, it is being realised that this duty also cannot be segregated but is bound up with all his other duties. In fact, that a citizen can serve his country best by remembering his duty to himself in the first place and his duty to humanity in the mass in the second.

Apart from the giving of his children to his country and his own personal service, local or national, as the case may be, there come his financial obligations to the country which gives him his livelihood.

One of the marks of the inefficient citizen is that hallowed grumbling at taxes, national and local. The State, any more than the Municipality, must not be regarded as a sort of shadowy enemy outside the citizens who compose it, but as the citizens themselves. If income tax or general rate or water rate seem excessive, he must remember that the fault lies with him and his fellows.

The good citizen will no more think of cheating the State in income tax or otherwise than he would of cheating his neighbour,

and that vicious social conscience which allows the otherwise honest man to make fraudulent income tax returns will have to give way to that social conscience which is the cement of society. Let him remember in this, as in other things, that "men always get the government they deserve." He cannot shelter himself behind himself. He is a unit of the community.

It is the lack of social conscience which lets a man spit in a tram-car or on the pavement to the danger of the community ; and the same thing which causes another to do everything possible to avoid service on a jury ; or a third to throw down paper in the public parks.

A citizen's next duty to his country, after personal service and economic support, is criticism. But his should be constructive criticism. It is not enough to show that things are wrong, but to show why they are wrong. And to this criticism there should be no limits, beyond those which might weaken his country in the face of a vindictive and powerful enemy.

The conscientious citizen will take where necessary the unpopular side of any question, remembering that all progress comes from the

individual. And he must be prepared also if needs be to suffer for his opinions and still to love . . . the hardest duty of all.

Neither the state nor the local community should have control over the private conscience even though the citizen should show himself to be one of those three unpopular persons—an anti-vaccinator, a vegetarian, or a "crank." (The crank in history has changed history before now.) The citizen has to decide, however, how far things are matters of conscience or advisability. St. Paul laid down an excellent guide when he wrote: "All things are lawful for me, but all things are not expedient," as he also, in I Corinthians xii. (verses 14-26) gives a perfect illustration of the spirit and body of citizenship. For, and it is as well to face these things, all the relations of life are finally questions of compromise. There are no absolutes. Each man and woman must decide for themselves where compromise must end and principle begin. The citizen must remember that principle can pass into obtuseness with surprising ease.

Although he must not expect to find any party agreeing with him altogether, he will probably find it desirable to join one or other

of the great political parties of the State, and this for the simple reason that the individual, especially in these days of combines, is powerless without an organisation behind him. If he wants to get things done he must get others to help him. He will be true to his party, but, again, not at the expense of principle. He will criticise unsparingly, and he will give credit to his opponents—to-day the unforgivable sin in politics. But he will always be himself captain of his own soul and beware, especially if he be an official, of the millstones of the party machine, which grind out all individuality.

The duty of the citizen to the *world* will be more easily considered later, in the chapter dealing with his training for that larger citizenship.

References

- “Love’s Coming of Age,” Edward Carpenter.
- “The Family,” C. F. Thwing.
- “Civil Government,” Locke.
- Plato’s “Republic.”
- “Man versus the State,” Herbert Spencer.
- “Reflections on the Revolution in France,” Burke.
- “The Theory of the State,” Bluntschli (see also works of Kant and Hegel.)
- “The New Testament” (1 Cor. xii.).

It may be that all citizenship rests upon the training of the child as citizen. Not a general "training," in the ordinary sense of that word, but a conscious, definite training for that citizenship which is the full blooming of young life.

And not a narrow, direct training for citizenship as for an examination subject. One can easily imagine such a training in which the word "citizenship" was never used. Words define, but they also cramp and disgust.

We are faced with the difficulty, however, that as such training embraces education in the broadest sense as well as in the sense most minute, we should need a series of volumes for its full discussion. After thought, the writer has decided to set out, so to speak, a sort of skeleton of ideas in connection with such training, concentrated to the utmost, as a sort of nucleus for thought and discussion by the student, thus following our original

thesis that all citizenship is largely a question of individual study and experience, not one of dogma or professorship, and that in it, up to a point, all men and women start equal.

Therefore it will be understood that what follows is given entirely undogmatically and with a full sense of its shortcomings. It is merely an attempt to set down within small compass and in more or less cohesive order a possible scheme of training, capable of the utmost modification, according to the individual.

One will start with the idea of regarding the child as potential Citizen, first, as a physical, then, as an intellectual and moral, and lastly, as a spiritual being. These three qualities form, at least in the writer's mind, the three ingredients of citizenship.

The average adult citizen, before marriage, if a man, scarcely thinks of the child; if a woman, vaguely, but with affection. After marriage, the child is apt to be regarded either as a sort of lovable plaything; as a nuisance; as "a regrettable incident;" or as something about which to boast.

The average scientist places the child under his microscope, anthropologically weighs and measures him, and generally

regards him as a body-and-brain being only. The spiritual, he usually ignores.

The average educationalist often in the beginning of youthful enthusiasm regards him as "a call;" then as a career; then as a means to live,

Few of these regard him consciously and definitely as potential citizen.

The *physical* may be compared to the metal of which a tool or machine is made. The *intellectual*, which, if you strip it, is really the same as the *moral*, may be compared to the element introduced when the machine is used by an intelligent workman. The *spiritual* may be compared to the element of inspiration which enters when the tool or machine is guided and inspired not merely by an intelligent workman, but by an artist. For, in citizenship, the spiritual is the spirit of the artist working through the child towards the unity of all life, a spirit informed and inspired by passion and by love.

Almost from birth, the average child is faced by "the Great Conspiracy," that is, by the conspiracy of the average grown-up to "form" the child irrespective of its individuality, and so preventing it from reaching full citizenship. That is why so

many schools—one does not say all schools—mould the child into a dead formula, and that is why, after it leaves school, it welcomes with open arms the after-school education which, giving its individuality a chance to expand, for the first time allows it to "learn" and to concentrate.

From birth, the fight of the average child is against suppression.

What the parent so often forgets is, first, how he himself thought as a child, and, secondly, how the modern child, coming under the impact of those forces which we have been considering in these pages, has, within a generation, leaped into a new world. The average parent is apt to think that his boy or girl thinks much as he thinks, but on an immature scale, instead of upon an entirely different plane; is disposed, usually unconsciously, to regard him as an automaton without individuality, and, because the intellectual process in the child is undeveloped and replaced by the instinctive, without judgment.

The child is, however, a sensitive plant, responsive to the slightest impressions from the outside. It, above all living things, has a flexible mentality, having a life which

flickers backwards and forwards between consciousness and unconsciousness. It is like a man waking in the dawn with the dreams of night still heavy on him. But the impressions upon the unconscious mind of the child, however impalpable, often later rise above the threshold of consciousness. That is one reason why everything that is said or done before the child matters to its future life as citizen. The unconscious or subjective mind records all.

The qualities of the child are so many channels for the development of citizenship, and, apart from certain broad divisions and a difference in type, are the same in both sexes. Broadly speaking, for example, the boy is the attacking, the creative animal—the girl the receptive. Brutality in the boy becomes cruelty in the girl. The active potency of the boy for either good or evil in the girl becomes passive.

After the desire to eat and sleep, the intelligent parent who intends to train his child as citizen will note in him first the desire for movement (the average parent hates motion and tries to "keep the child quiet"); then mimicry or imitation (the child has an overwhelming and not always justified belief

in the grown-up); then "wanting to know" (regarded as a nuisance by many parents but really the quality most valuable to the child in his training towards adult citizenship). Then he will notice, and, if he be wise, be thankful for, the child's earnestness (the desire to do his best); his implacability (springing from his earnestness and sense of justice); and that curious, disquieting fact to so many grown-ups, that he sees everything and very often sees with unpleasant accuracy, for he does not look through the grown-up distorting mirrors of politics, religion, etc.

Finally, he will discover in his boy or girl that egoism of the seeking mind, or determination to realise himself or herself fully, which, directed into wrong channels, may lead to the most degrading love of self, or which, rightly directed, may become that enlightened egoism which as we have already said is as essential to citizenship as self-sacrifice.

Leaving the child to himself and coming to his training as citizen from birth to puberty, the two decisive stages of all life, one is starting from the basis that the object of all education and training is preparation for life—that is for citizenship. Can we, outside the education

which comes to the young adult through life or through the newer channels for self-development now being opened, and with of course the inevitable exceptions, truthfully say to-day that modern education concerns itself primarily with this ?

Can we say that either the parents, the teachers, the children, or society itself is satisfied with our present educational system ? We know we cannot. Complaints are general and detailed not only in England but outside it.

We know that modern education has failed, largely because it lacks a conscious goal. It does not realise that the whole object of education should be the preparation of the child for citizenship, for living, and, above all, for parentage—not primarily for passing examinations, however necessary in our life of to-day these may sometimes be—not for becoming “accomplished,” but simply for life.

Herbert Spencer says in his book on “Education” : “If by some strange chance not a vestige of us descended to the remote future save a pile of our school-books or some college examination papers, we may imagine how puzzled an antiquary of the period

would be on finding in them no sign that the learners were ever likely to be parents. 'This must have been the *curriculum*, for their celibates,' we may fancy him concluding."

When some years ago the writer made a tour of certain European countries, partly for the purpose of studying their educational systems, he was much struck, out of hundreds of others, by two expressions of opinion from two men, one of them his country's national Director of Education, and the other, one of the most distinguished of living professors of education. The first said: "The boy is when he joins the school a perfect being—perfect physically and intellectually balanced. I ask—'What changes him?'" The second, a strong advocate of some of the newer educational systems, especially those which seek to open the doors of knowledge to the student by his or her own effort and self-development after he or she has left school, said: "A time will yet come when we shall regard our methods of education exactly as we now regard the physicians of the Middle Ages; a time when the teacher who conceives himself able to educate children with dictionaries which cannot be remembered, and by rules which cannot be understood,

will be as much a tragi-comic figure as the charlatan who pretends to cure sickness by spells or universal panaceas."

The main criticisms of modern education by the student of citizenship, apart from the above, would probably take the line of the fact that it destroys instinct, which is but to say that it destroys individuality, i.e. consciousness; that it stereotypes and suppresses; that it treats the child not as an entity but as a unit of a crowd.

Further, that it fits the child not for life but for examinations, which are something quite other; that it is not synthetic (i.e. that it does not teach the child fully and impartially about other systems, religions, countries, etc.); that it gives a smattering of many subjects instead of an all-round knowledge as foundation for a specialist knowledge of one or two; and, above all, that it does not accustom the child to regard itself as a member of a community—as a social unit.

Finally, that it prevents the child from *thinking*, for the child in the beginning is original, and therefore that it is the cause of immense waste of talent and original thought.

Yet it is precisely this quality of original thought which the changing world of to-day so much needs in its effort to adjust itself to new conditions and to prepare the social structure for the new strains.

To pass now from the destructive to the constructive: what are the first things to be done to clear away the obstacles to the development of the child to a conscious citizenship?

First, the pedant must go. Then, the indifferent parent will have to become interested. Then, instead of relegating civic training to the backstairs of politics, as is done to-day in most civilised countries, the politician must be made to help by regarding education estimates as at least of as much importance as war estimates, even though the same political kudos cannot be won by attention to them.

So we come to a consideration of the trainers of the future citizen.

First, one places the child's mother, who should not only be a mother to the young citizen but a sort of big girl-comrade to her own boys and girls. To her the child stands closest at the outset of life. To her hands are due those first impressions in the plastic

child-clay which endure in the stone of the adult life.

Then, the father, who should be comrade as well as father to his children and who, like the mother, will learn the secret of understanding of the child, which is not to regard him as "only a child," but as comrade and friend.

There are no "children."

Then, the Artist, who, whether painter or player, musician or dramatist, will reveal to the child the hidden meanings of that imagination and creative impulse which all children possess to greater or less degree.

And then there is the supreme educator—life itself. But for this educator to do its work, and even to-day, despite cramping and binding, it contrives to do its work some time or somehow, it is essential that the well-meaning adult should not stand between life and the child.

As a great educationalist has written : "The pedagogue with his canon comes between the child and nature only to limit and obscure. His business is to leave the whole thing alone."

But you will ask : "Where in all this do the schoolmaster and schoolmistress come in ? "

The reply is that he or she, in their modern form, will gradually go out, and with their going "the school" as we know it to-day will be profoundly modified. In their place will come the artist as the interpreter of life and with him the *specialist*, regarded first as the teacher of and contributor to that all-round basis upon which true specialisation alone can be built and to which many of his kind will contribute, and, secondly, as the teacher of the subject in which the student wishes to specialise.

The School, as we know it to-day, will, in a word, go outside the schoolhouse into the fields, into the specialist's class-room, and into life itself, but before all that is possible life will have to undergo many changes. And one believes, inevitably, that the natural transition stage to such migration, as thousands of the youth and adults of both sexes find it to-day, lies in those systems of mental concentration, the development of memory, and, so to speak, education to life, which for countless and increasing numbers of earnest men and women in our time have meant their first real "education."

One says this all the more regretfully in view of the numbers of sincere hard-working

men and women who have devoted their lives to the education of the child and some of whom, at least, have not found their efforts altogether in vain. The main cause of their lack of success on the whole has been the absence of a leading motive like citizenship as the goal of training.

A powerful case can be made for co-education of the sexes, first in the home by father and mother as is of course the case to-day, in which brothers and sisters mix and are brought up together, and, later, at the school or university. The actual results of to-day's experiments in co-education show that such education makes for a high moral standard by the abolition of the "male" and "female" viewpoint of the child and its replacement by the "human;" and as a channel for citizenship literally makes the child ready for that "human" rather than "sex"-world, hitherto rigidly differentiated, which is developing in the twentieth century.

But this highly debatable subject would alone take far more space than we have at our disposal for its proper consideration, as would that part of the modern science of eugenics known as "pre-natal culture," the development of which some of the world's

scientists at least believe will one day have profound effects upon society. This also applies to training in the facts of sex, the most delicate, difficult, and dangerous though most essential part of all training and which would need special and exhaustive treatment.

Having broadly and all too shortly considered the broad premises upon which the education of the citizen-child has been conceived, the place has come briefly to set down, and purely as a ground for thought and discussion, a short and simple syllabus of what seems to the writer the proper training to citizenship of the child, arranged in what would seem to be its natural order. We are remembering that nothing "comes natural," or rather that nature is enormously dirigible, and that as man advances, art becomes nature.

First the *physical*, regarding direct self-preservation as the first law of nature :

How and what to eat.

How to keep the body clean.

How to walk.

How to breathe.

The training of the senses.

Gymnastics.

Athletics.

Then *mental* training :

Speaking (that is, the proper pronunciation of words and use of the vocal organs).

Reading and writing.

(The above three as means of communication.)

Arithmetic.

Specialist subjects, whether mathematics, language, etc.

Finally, the *training* spiritual :

Discipline.

Honour.

Comradeship.

Sense of responsibility.

Religion. (Solved by bringing the Artist into the school, and coming from a "passion" rather than a "moral" to life. For with the artist comes life, and with life, religion. Love of God will come from love of Man.)

So we epitomise what would seem from the foregoing to be the prime conditions for successful training of the child towards citizenship :

i. That he or she must not be considered as "a child." That the educator must find out how he or she thinks by remember-

ing his own childhood. That the child must be left alone to learn itself, that is, must be free, which means the development of individuality and life and therefore growth.

2. The realisation that there are no "normal" children. All children are abnormal, in the sense that each child has its own individuality to a degree unknown in the adult. Each child has to be treated as a separate unit.

3. That the artist and specialist must come into the school.

We find that all we have hitherto said can be summed up in the one word *growth*, which is the object of life and therefore of citizenship.

There is a passage, one of the greatest in modern literature, and the very incarnation of the spirit of citizenship, replete with symbolic significance for the man or woman of understanding, which one gives here from H. G. Wells's "Food of the Gods":

"Through us and through the little Folk the Spirit looks and learns. From us, by word and birth and act it must pass—to still greater lives. This earth is no resting-place; this earth is no playing place. . . .

We fight not for ourselves but for growth—growth that goes on for ever. To-morrow, whether we live or die, growth will conquer through us. That is the law of the spirit for evermore. . . . To grow out of these cracks and crannies, out of these shadows and darknesses, into greatness and the light ! Greater . . . greater, my Brothers ! And then, still greater. To grow, and again—to grow . . . to grow at last into the fellowship and understanding of God.”

References

- “Review of Reviews,” Jan. 1904.
- “The Outlook,” Dec. 1902.
- “Education,” Mar. 1903.
- “Munsey’s Magazine,” Feb. 1906 and Mar. 1906.
- “Education,” Herbert Spencer.
- “Mankind in the Making” and “The Food of the Gods,”
H. G. Wells.

WE have now a fairly clear perspective of citizenship in its various phases and know, roughly, what would seem to be its limitations and the pitfalls to be avoided.

We have followed the evolution of the Citizen from prehistoric times, through history, down to the present, and have looked at the machinery of citizenship. We have considered the Citizen both as man and woman and have broadly differentiated their spheres and duties. We have thrashed out, in broad outline, the training of the child as citizen. We have analysed the general principles underlying the individualist and the democratic concepts of citizenship and have seen how each modifies the other.

And finally, we have seen how inevitably the meaning and scope of citizenship in our day is being enlarged.

We have at least a solid groundwork upon which we can build our citizenship—each in his or her own way.

It now remains for us to discuss that other type of Citizen, the appearance and evolution of whom is perhaps the most significant phenomenon of our time—the Citizen of the World.

Before regarding the Citizen of the World more nearly, it will be well to trace why and how he has evolved.

The evolution of the world-citizen can be viewed in many ways and from many angles. But perhaps the easiest and most direct way of viewing it is as the astronomer views the formation of worlds in the heavens from the original nebulae of flaming gas through the stages of liquid and solid.

Above us, in the night skies, we are looking at millions of worlds in process of formation from their original nuclei. About us, through this little world of ours, we see in the same way countless tiny worlds of men and women forming themselves about certain nuclei—forming under the impulse of citizenship which, like the heavenly bodies, has its own laws. These worlds, in their turn, unite to form social systems, combining and recombining, growing from the infinitely small and simple of the club or family to the infinitely great and complex of the nation or commonwealth.

All this under the elemental urge of citizenship, used by the Powers Behind for the evolution of the human race.

We saw how around the nucleus of cave or camp the citizenship of primitive man first showed itself. Historically, we saw how citizenship developed itself around the nuclei of slavery and serfdom, feudalism and capitalism, how it used both Paganism and, afterwards, Christianity, as nuclei on the plane of religion. We see how in our time it has seized upon those two other and apparently antagonistic political nuclei—Individualism and Democracy. For, unlike men, the gods are quite indifferent as to their tools and methods. They think only of the end.

Or, to take another series of these nuclei, we have followed the evolution of the citizen through the centres of the individual, the family, the community, and the nation.

Man, the citizen, is a social animal. He seizes upon any and every chance to chum with his fellows, to be sociable. "Fellowship is life, the lack of fellowship, death," he says. In his social club, his sports club, his church, as in those larger centres of the township, the party, and the nation, he is

eager to come together with his fellows, to form his communities and societies. Like those minute and industrious creatures which swarm over and through the coral island which they raise above the surface of uncharted seas, so man works on and over the coral islands of citizenship, upon which some day palm trees will grow and a higher life develop.

Only now, for the first time in history, man the untiring and unsatisfied, searching for new worlds to conquer, has found the world itself. Man the Citizen is no longer satisfied to be citizen of a town or a province or even a country—he demands the citizenship of the world.

Some of the reasons for this we have traced in the foregoing pages. It is due primarily to that forward sweep of mechanical invention which has thrown the world together, to those cables under the waters, those steamships and railway trains, telegraph and telephone wires upon the surface of the earth, and to that invisible mesh of "wireless" above the surface, through which the aeroplane wings its way, for man is no longer earthbound. It is due to all this that thought has been exchanged, that the peoples of the

earth are just beginning to know one another, and that the barriers of the centuries have been honeycombed and obliterated.

Man, the Citizen, was yesterday three-dimensional. He thought in terms of length and breadth and height. Now he is rapidly become four-dimensional.

That is why the Citizen of the World has made his appearance.

Let us be clear as to what we mean by "Citizen of the World."

One does not mean the Citizen Cosmopolitan who, careless as to causes, indifferent to evolution, passes from world's capital to world's capital, as he says "at home everywhere," for private pleasure or profit. Uninterested in the tremendous shadow-play of life, save where it trenches upon his own pleasure and convenience, the Citizen Cosmopolitan, or, as he is sometimes called, "the man of the world," is the antithesis of the Citizen of the World, who, desperately interested in his fellows, believing that the proper study of mankind is man, watching the great earth-drama which unfolds itself each day to the initiated, that is, to the student of human beings, seeks to link up the whole world by bonds of citizenship and understanding.

He seeks, in fact, to understand something of the drama and the part of himself and his country in that drama.

The Citizen of the World is perhaps a dreamer of dreams. But all the world's forerunners, the men and women who have played the leading rôles in the earth-drama, have been dreamers of dreams. His head in the clouds, his feet will yet be on solid earth.

Those men and women who in various countries, and interested as they are in world-movements, are to-day showing themselves singly as world-citizens, and who to-morrow will show themselves in thousands where to-day they show themselves in hundreds, are men and women who have learned the lesson in citizenship which has been running through these pages—the lesson that progress, to be permanent, can only be made step by step, each bricklayer of the temple of citizenship seeing that each row of his bricks is well and truly laid before the next is attempted.

Such men and women, not being led away by phrases, realise that it is not sufficient to have vague and beautiful aspirations towards such things as "brotherhood" and

“peace,” “fraternity” and “love,” but that every aspiration must be capable of translation by solid effort into concrete happening. Whilst they wish to be international in the sense of getting the best from every country, they do not fall into the error of thinking that nationality is played out and that country has no call upon the individual. Countries have not come into existence by chance.

For the Citizen of the World will remember that only through a full and *conscious* nationhood can a fine inter-nationality or world-citizenship be attained or even comprehended. Nationality is but the larger individuality, leading to the widest individualist conception of all—that of Inter-nationality. The man who fails in his duty to himself is likely to fail in that to his family ; and if to his family, then to the community, the nation, and the world. The citizen cannot run before he walks.

These citizens of the world realise that individuality is the salt of life and its cement. They understand that just as the most enduring, vitalised nation is that made up of free individualities, so the only internationhood worthy of the name is one made up of nations free and independent.

But all these practical considerations, and it is the dreamer who of all men needs to be practical, does not blind the world-citizen of either sex to the fact that humanity is standing upon the threshold of a new experiment in the larger citizenship—that is a free federation of nations, the idea of which, however imperfect in itself, stood behind the League of Nations of which we have heard so much. The world-citizen has realised that with the new socio-mechanical problems opened up by the aeroplane and wireless, the affairs of the world can no longer be administered by a series of separate nations each legislating independently of the other in watertight compartments.

They see, for example, in the advent of international aerial legislation, as in certain international legislation for labour-control, the writing on the wall for the man or woman with eyes to see and brain to understand.

And with all this it is beginning to dawn in varying degree upon ever-increasing numbers of men and women in all countries that the old conception of highly centralised administrations, whether of official bureaucracies or national parliaments, is beginning to pass into the limbo of forgotten things. It is

slowly beginning to be realised that, nationally, the local parliament, whether it takes the form of the municipal council chamber, trade union branch, or debating society, is fast becoming the channel of expression and action of the individual citizen rather than the national parliament, and internationally that world-congresses and the international exchange of thought by individuals are one day going to replace the diplomat and the soldier.

It is not that these things have passed. But they are beginning to pass under the subtle solvent of citizenship, first in the individual country, and then in the world. Some morning the world will wake up to find perhaps that these things, and this is especially true since the war, have ceased to have significance in the minds of men and that with the passing of that significance the forms themselves will pass.

Apart from the ordinary official and diplomatic channels of communication, there is building up through the newer world-citizenship that parliament of the world of which hitherto only the poets have dared to write. It is being built up not only by the more obvious world-congress but by

the constant exchange of book and pamphlet ; by the translation of books into other languages ; by personal travel ; and in a hundred other impalpable ways.

For in these days world-citizenship is coming to have very definite meaning. Despite war and international jealousies, nations are gradually being drawn closer and closer together and the individual citizen is beginning to realise that the understanding of other countries' methods of thought is perhaps the best safety valve for popular prejudice and therefore for popular international passion. And this understanding is worth all the peace movements in the world, however well-intentioned these may be.

It is because of all this that the Citizen of the World is preparing himself or herself for the now inevitable rearrangements in the relationships of nations and for the new world that is forming behind the cloud-screen of the after-the-war events. It is not only for himself or herself that the preparation is made, it is made, and consciously, for the children who will enter this new world.

It is because of this that he or she loses no opportunity whether by reading or travel of getting into touch with and finding out

the thought-trends of other countries and races, and it is for this that the door of the mind is kept ajar for the best of other countries in literature, or art, or citizenship.

Our Citizen of the World is keeping in his mind, generally, the ultimate ideal of a federation of world-states, but a federation in which, as in the family, the community, and the nation itself, each constituent part retains its individuality and independence and by means of which the whole will function for the good of the world and the glory of God.

WE have now reached the last milestone of our journey together on the road of citizenship. We started in the dawn of life before history was, we have come to the point where we are faced with the illimitable future, and with it are faced by the last of the triple interrogation with which we set out : " Whence ? Why ? Whither ? "

What are the main developments and trends of citizenship in the future likely to be ?

In the first place, and this has received violent impetus since the war, which has made some at least realise that only through the evolution of a fuller and *conscious* citizenship can similar happenings be prevented in the future, we are about to see Citizenship placed high on the scale of men's thoughts and educational schemes, and with it a broadening of the whole idea of education and human evolution.

The first steps towards the rebuilding of society after the war, past, we are going to

see an intensifying of that exchange of thought and view between the different countries, which before the war was so marked a feature, and we are going to see a further chapter in the development of the inter-federated experiment of which the United States in its evolution has given us the first example.

We are going to see society pass through a series of convulsions, as we have seen it—those convulsions which are the necessary preliminary to the birth of a new society from the womb of time—a birth in which citizenship will be the midwife of the new society.

We are going to see a re-arrangement of forces, political and social. We are going to see sharp cleavages between old friends and as intimate coming together of one-time enemies, and with this the transformation and broadening of horizons, national and inter-national.

Next, we are likely to see profound modifications of the democratic experiment in citizenship and wide rifts in the forces of democracy upon the lines already stated.

It will probably be found as time goes on that on the economic side the solution of the problem of poverty will be found to loose a

whole series of new problems, not least the realisation that the solution of the economic problem may even intensify certain moral and spiritual problems. This realisation is entirely sure to sharply split democracy and, with it, democratic citizenship, into two camps—one the materialist, the other the anti-materialist, and the indications of this even to-day are not wanting.

It will be discovered that men and women who are united upon the solution of physical problems may be as sharply divided upon the solution of spiritual, and with this will go the realisation that the problems of society are not only never-ending but increasingly complex, demanding constantly greater powers of head and heart for their solving—in a word that there is no finality and no Utopia.

This increasing complexity will have to be met by increasing specialisation. The trend of the citizenship of the future will probably be to recognise how imperative it is to breed the specialist and not to hamper him by so-called "democratic" interference. The community on the larger side will probably not be administered by dead-weight voting, except in the primary instance of election of administrators, but through expert

bodies or bodies of experts co-operating with the State.

Democracy will be found to be, not an absolute ideal in itself, but simply a working means to an end unseen. It is likely to be regarded by the citizen of the future as a method rather than as a goal. It will be found to develop upon lines hitherto unthought, and the only thing that one can say with any assurance, having regard to history, is that the more Democracy proves to be individualist the better chance it will have of permanence and value.

By "individualist" one means that the greater the demands it makes from the individual, whether of character or *morale* or responsibility, the greater the chance of its success. No society, however perfectly framed theoretically; no phrases, however beautiful and well-meaning; not even any rebellion in the face of tyranny or abuse, will ever have any chance of permanent success unless individuality and "character," that indefinable word which means so much, have been developed through time and training.

The proof of all this lies in the story of evolution. It is not by causing catastrophic changes in the present social system that

democracy can come to its own, but only by the gradual assumption of responsibility with privilege and the "making good" first in the municipality, as it is doing, then in the county, and then in the country. It is the business of citizenship to develop the machine as its work progresses.

The writer at least believes that we are about to see in this age of nervous flux, amongst much that is degenerate and weak, much that is shifting because it is in the throes of dissolution, the setting of a premium upon the training and development of the intellectual powers, and afterwards of that character and *morale* to which this foundation is necessary. With this the necessity of mental concentration is likely to be recognised as it has never before been recognised in the history of the world. He ventures to think this because not only do all the signs of the times show this sharp differentiation and recognition, but because, as always, with the world thrown into the melting-pot as it has been thrown since the Great War, those forces which in themselves are concentrated and conscious will have a supreme opportunity for decisive influence in the moulding of society.

We are about to see the parish and even the national concept of citizenship pass gradually but inevitably under the stress of the new forces into a world-concept, but, as one thinks, a concept in which greater, not less, accentuation of the individual and of nationality will show itself, all this following the law, before mentioned, that as man advances from the simple to the complex his various functions tend to become always more highly specialised. This is also true in the world of citizenship.

Finally, one believes, rightly or wrongly, that mankind is trending towards the conception of a greater economic equality combined with the recognition of a spiritual aristocracy, all of which can only come from that "individualist-co-operation" of the newer citizenship to which we have so constantly referred. We are about to see under the evolution of the newer citizenship, not a levelling up or down, but a wider and more intensive recognition of spiritual and intellectual values. The broad distinctions of the society of the future will not be by money or by class or by blood—but rather by spirit. So long as men and women breathe, inferiority will pay its tribute, consciously or unconsciously, to

superiority, whether on the physical, the intellectual, or, above all, on the spiritual plane.

'That tribute will not be a money tribute, nor will it be the tribute of the slave, but a natural love and worship of men and women by men and women, with the superiors mixing freely with their inferiors and loving them, knowing that all the sons and daughters of earth are bound together in a common comradeship of humanity, that they are all travellers on the road towards the same goal, and that this comradeship and fraternity can only be realised in one way—by the evolution of a higher, a nobler, and above all a more conscious Citizenship.'

The References

Note.—The references given at the foot of each chapter represent the books or portions of books which may be read with advantage in connection with the subject-matter of the chapter.

The following is a full list of these references :

"On Liberty," John Stuart Mill.

"Education," Herbert Spencer.

"A Guildsman's Interpretation of History," Arthur J. Penty. (Geo. Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1920.)

"Human Origins," Samuel Laing.

"The New Encyclopædia of Social Reform." (Funk & Wagnalls Co.)

"History of Political Economy," Prof. Ingram.

“History of European Morals,” Lecky.

“The Ethics of Aristotle.”

“The Old Testament.”

“Rome,” W. Warde Fowler.

“Political Theories of the Middle Ages,” Dr. Otto Gierke.

“Salammbô,” Gustave Flaubert;

“The Egyptian Book of the Dead.”

“Chinese Religion,” Wm. Loftus Hare.

“The Ancient Lowly,” C. Osborne Ward.

“Mankind in the Making,” H. G. Wells.

“The New Republicanism,” H. G. Wells.

“The New Testament.”

“Il Principe,” Machiavelli.

“Minority Report of the Poor Law Commission.”
(Fabian Society, 1909.)

“The Commonsense of Municipal Trading,” G. Bernard Shaw, 1912. (Fabian Society.)

“English Public Health Administration,” B. G. Bannington, 1915. (King.)

“The Reorganisation of Local Government,” C. M. Lloyd, 1919. (Fabian Society.)

“Life and Labour of the People in London,” Charles Booth.

“Modern Housing in Town and Country” (London, 1905), Jas. Cornes.

“Public Health and Housing” (London, 1901), Sykes.

“Reports of Tenement-House Commissions, American Economic Association Publications,” viii., No. 2-3.

“Compte Rendu et Documents (1900) of the Congrès Internationale des Habitations à Bon Marché.”

“Infantile Mortality and Infants’ Milk Depots,” G. F. McCleary, M.D., 1905.

“The Control of the Milk Supply,” Dr. Newman.
 (“British Medical Journal,” 1904.)

“Infant Mortality,” Dr. G. Newman (1907).

Plato’s “Republic.”

“American Communities,” W. A. Hinds.

“History of American Socialisms,” Noyes.

“Anarchism and Socialism,” George Plechanoff.
(Twentieth Century Press, Ltd., London.)

“Socialism in Church History,” Rev. Conrad Noel.
(1910, Palmer, 5s. net.)

“The Soul of Denmark,” Shaw Desmond. (Fisher Unwin, Ltd., 1917.)

“A History of Co-operation in Rochdale” (1893).

“Labour Co-partnership in Great Britain and Ireland”
(1898), Beatrice Potter.

“Paris,” Emile Zoli.

“Through Bolshevik Russia,” Mrs. Philip Snowden.
(1920, Cassell, 5s. net.)

“The Russian Republic,” Colonel Malone, M.P.
(Allen & Unwin, London, 2s. 6d.)

“The Man *v.* the State,” Herbert Spencer.

“The Sins of Legislators,” Herbert Spencer.

“On Compromise,” John Morley.

“Classes and Masses,” W. H. Mallock.

“Economics,” A. T. Hadley.

“The Wealth of Nations,” Adam Smith.

“The Subjection of Women,” John Stuart Mill.

“Women as Trade Unionists,” Gertrude Tuckwell.

“History of Trade-Unionism,” Sidney Webb. (Longmans & Co.)

“Women and Economics,” Mrs. Perkins Gilman.

“A Modern Utopia,” H. G. Wells.

“Love’s Coming of Age,” Edward Carpenter.

“The Family,” C. F. Thwing.
“Civil Government,” Locke.
“Reflections on the Revolution in France,” Burke.
“The Theory of the State,” Bluntschli.
Various magazines :
 “Review of Reviews,” Jan. 1904.
 “The Outlook,” Dec. 1902.
 “Education,” Mar. 1903.
 “Munsey’s Magazine,” Feb. and Mar. 1906.
“The Food of the Gods,” H. G. Wells.

Other Books to Read

“Lessons in Citizenship,” A. J. Waldegrave. (Nelson & Sons, 1s. 6d.)
“Ethics of Citizenship,” T. MacCunn. (Maclehose, 2s. 6d.)
“The Elements of the Duties and Rights of Citizenship,” W. D. Aston. (Clive, 1s. 6d.)
“Science in Public Affairs,” Ed. J. E. Hand. (Geo. Allen, 5s.)
“The Citizen of To-morrow,” Ed. S. E. Keeble, 1906. (R. Culley, 2s.)
“The Citizen and his Duties,” W. F. Trotter (Jack, 1s. net.)

